THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Bishop of Birmingham's ' Rede Lecture ' has for its title *Religion Amid Turmoil*.[1] It might easily have been issued in a more attractive form than this rather tawdry-looking, paper-covered pamphlet. But the important thing is the contents, and anything Dr. BARNES has to say about the present age and its prospects is worthy of attention. There are many features of the present time that suggest a comparison with former times, and the Bishop begins his Lecture with such a comparison.

The ' turmoil ' of this period is, he says, the result of humanity's proudest achievements. A hundred years ago witnessed the invention of railways and steamships, of rifles and Gatling guns. China, Japan, and ' darkest Africa ' were brought into the sphere of our ' destructive civilization.' Since then the aeroplane has ended the physical, and the wireless has ended the mental, isolation of almost all regions and groups of men. Simultaneously, weapons of war have become so overwhelmingly destructive that all great cities are in danger of mass obliteration. The death rate has decreased to such an extent that the population has increased to about twenty-two hundred millions and food supplies are becoming inadequate. Education has spread and with it knowledge and discontent.

There is, indeed, a turmoil, racial, political, economic—a maelstrom in which we all find ourselves struggling. And Dr. BARNES invited his hearers to consider its outcome. He believes that ultimately the spiritual bases of human life are all-important and he asks us to wonder how religion will emerge from the turmoil. But to begin with he wishes us to set aside religion and look at the problems of race, politics, and economics.

Many will say that, of these three elements in the human situation, race, or the nationalism constructed from it, is the primary danger. They will instance the last War which was fundamentally an outbreak of racial fervour in Germany and also in Japan, which is as ready to give life for her country's welfare. But Dr. BARNES doubts whether the sentiment of race is either the most dangerous, or even a permanently dangerous, element in the present turmoil of mankind. Racial animosities do not persist if there be freedom and justice in the relations between different peoples. He points to Scotland in its relation to England, and America with its complex of different nationalities.

Dr. BARNES also instances one hopeful sign of coming betterment—the strong tendency towards a world-wide group of states, and speaks of a ' new unity ' as its outcome. This will come through a struggle of ideas and compromises and hopes, a cold war none the less intense because the restraints of human feeling would prohibit the use of weapons that can only too easily desolate earth's fairest lands. This unity transcending racial sentiment and national patriotism, once achieved, will increase as men seek security. Once the scaffolding of world-wide order is put up the belief will grow strong that its destruction would be a crime against humanity.

There are many who view this optimistic forecast with disbelief. But, says Dr. BARNES, I do not share this pessimism because of my faith. I believe that the *logos* of Greek thinkers, personified by the later Hebrews as Wisdom, and as the Holy Spirit by the early Christians, is ultimately supreme on earth. Humanity is His creation. Human folly is great, but God's will on earth is ultimately victorious. All considerations of human behaviour lead us to this problem of religion. What is the significance of the human race in the great scheme of creation ? What is the individual's significance ? ' I believe that, speaking generally, the principles which underlie Christianity give us an answer as near to the truth as we can get and that in the present turmoil humanity will make sound progress so far as it accepts them for guidance. But, while I am thus persuaded, I would not pretend that the traditional formulations

[1] Cambridge University Press ; 1s. 6d. net.

of Christianity can be wholly maintained. The Christian principles that remain cogent are, however, as I see the situation, vital to the right development of human civilization. Will those principles prevail or will other forms of faith capture man's allegiance ? '

From all forms of education and enlightenment there will arise a new form of competition between different faiths ; and only a survey of their past history and present strength, and, more especially, of their capacity for change under pressure from new knowledge, can give us hints as to the religion of the future. Dr. BARNES therefore proceeds to describe and analyse the promise contained in each of the great religions. A large part of his lecture is devoted to this survey, and he finds no real ground for believing that any of them holds the prospect of religious satisfaction. This part of the Lecture should be carefully studied.

The most interesting and vital part of his survey is devoted to Communism. Dr. BARNES has little respect for the sophistries of Dialectical Materialism. He thinks very little of Lenin's intellectual equipment. Many of his utterances, Dr. BARNES thinks, belong to a level of thought to be expected in a medical student in his first year. But Dr. BARNES thinks that a part of Communism may be detached which can best be described as Economic Humanism. And it is this that has attracted many enthusiastic followers. It seeks to apply economics to the welfare of the common man. This has no necessary connexion with Atheism. Indeed, it would more naturally cohere with Christianity, and it would seem probable that a modified Communism, supported by Christian sympathy, might easily emerge.

Such thoughts lead naturally to an inquiry, for ourselves of fundamental importance, as to the future of Christianity. As we see the matter, its position is immensely strong. Intellectually and emotionally its appeal is greater than that of any rival faith. It must purge itself from traditions which have become childish, but it need not thereby lose the simplicity of greatness. In fact, one of the dangers that beset it in this country is that its teachers, in their desire to avoid the crudities of popular evangelists, use a language, and what purports to be a philosophy, divorced from ordinary life.

Dr. BARNES is certain that we are passing through a new renaissance, probably to be followed by a new Christian reformation which may be on a vast scale. If this reformation embodies profound changes, Christians should not be surprised or dismayed. During the last hundred years increase and change have been, so far as we know, without parallel in any century of human history. But, whatever religion emerges from the present turmoil—and ' personally I do not doubt that it will be a form of Christianity '—it must be such that simple people, living close to Nature, find in it an interpretation of their own most treasured experiences and a reason for the hope at which, even in desperation, they grasp.

Mr. Hugh Ross WILLIAMSON, playwright and novelist, enters the field of Christian Ethics with a little book, readable and provocative, on *The Seven Christian Virtues*.[1] It is not his first entrance into this field. Some fifteen years ago he wrote a morality play called ' The Seven Deadly Virtues,' in which he endorsed Bernard Shaw's words that ' hell is the home of honour, duty, justice, and the rest of the seven deadly virtues.' He returned to the theme again in 1939 with a pamphlet entitled ' A.D. 33,' in which he maintained that ' Christ was crucified by the good citizens of Jerusalem.'

Now from within the Church, whose true nature he understands better, in this exposition of faith, hope, charity, prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude, he holds that ' the pre-Christian values and virtues, even when they were founded on Natural Law and on prophetic revelation, had to be baptized—and so radically changed—before they could properly be called Christian virtues. Even where the names remained the same, the content was different.'

The point of view which he is concerned to deny is expressed by Mr. Christopher Hollis when he says that, in a world already in the Divine providence prepared for the gospel, ' values that make their appearance before the Incarnation can be as properly called Christian as those which appear after it.' And the point of view which he is concerned to affirm is expressed by the late Bishop Strong when he says that ' a Christian life's aim is not balance or harmony or adaptation to a complicated environment ; it implies the facing of the fact that the true interest of man's whole life is not here at all.' This, he adds, is after all, the teaching of the New Testament.

In Mr. S. H. Hooke's phrase, it is ' the internal logic of the Cross ' that has transformed the meaning of all the virtues, Jewish and Greek alike ; it has taken faith and hope and love, prudence and

[1] S.C.M. ; 7s. 6d. net.

justice and temperance and fortitude, and defined them anew for those who, being baptized into the Death, undergo a second birth in which they see this world and the traffic of it with new, awakened eyes.

In the modern period in which we now live the metamorphosis of the virtues achievable by the religion of the Cross takes place in a 'post-Christian' world, in which the State is once more pagan, though often paying lip-service to Christianity and, despite itself, inheriting much from Christendom; and it is Mr. WILLIAMSON's deep concern to show what should be the right attitude of Christians living in such a world. The principles he lays down may be found in current treatises on moral theology, but his emphases are all his own.

Take, for example, the Christian virtue of Justice. It is here laid down that the first duty under Justice of the Christian is to give God His due. How then is the practice of Christian Justice best conceived? First of all, says our author, in the due observance of the duties of religion; we should persevere in the ordinances which God has commanded rather than neglect them in favour of our own inventions. Then in forgiveness, compassion, and benevolence; this comes when we discover we dare not invoke the Justice, and throw ourselves upon the Mercy. It is the Christian paradox that 'to do justly' *is* 'to love mercy.' To ask concerning the reputedly Just Man, Does he go to church regularly? and Does he, as a general principle, refuse to go to law? would seem pointless by worldly standards but is vital from the Christian standpoint.

But our author's individual emphasis on Christian duties also appears when we pass from Justice to Temperance. The main concern of this virtue has become in moral theology the teaching of sex. And Mr. WILLIAMSON is of opinion that much, if not most, of the sexual sin committed by the young is the direct outcome of the much greater sin committed against the young by society, which has made normal family life impossible. Yet the Christian duty of Temperance remains, and the natural appetites are to be restrained and moderated out of love for God and for the sake of our duty to Him. Being God-given they are to be used for His glory and the fulfilment of their rational end.

Just as in the case of Justice the best approach is through its fruits in forgiveness, compassion and benevolence, so in the case of Temperance the best approach may be not only in connexion with bodily purity but also with the associated virtues of humility and courtesy. As for courtesy, it is a great practical corrective to the narrower forms of intemperance, in which there is a tendency to withdraw from ordinary society for the indulgence of appetite in solitude or in a selected company. And as for humility, it is a constant ally of Temperance; for the really humble man does not forget that his body is the gift of God to be used in His service and shrinks from that self-assertive egotism which so often expresses itself in the 'sins of the flesh.'

Literature.

MODERN THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.

THE late Dr. Thomas Hywel Hughes, at one time Principal of the Scottish Congregational College, Edinburgh, made a number of thoughtful and useful contributions to the Christian interpretation of psychology and mysticism. One admired the ability and diligence, not to say the Christian spirit, of which they were evidence. Before his death he had prepared a book on the Atonement, and had fortunately arranged for Dr. J. T. Hornsby to read the proofs for the press. The book is now before us in attractive form—*The Atonement* (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net).

It is not a history of the doctrine. Nor is it a study of the Scriptural witness to it. It is rather, as the author himself has said, an examination of the various theories and the more recent trends of thought with regard to the Atonement, as these have appeared in the works of modern British theologians. As a result of his examination Dr. Hughes has adopted a certain grouping of the theories, though he does not claim to have attained any more than an approximate classification of the writers. Thus, under the Satisfaction Theories we find the name of P. T. Forsyth, under the Penal Theories those of Dale and Denney, under the Ethical Satisfaction Theories those of McLeod Campbell and R. C. Moberly, under the Moral Influence Theory that of Rashdall, and under the

Mystical Theories that of John Caird. Though Dale and McLeod Campbell can hardly be called 'modern,' their continued influence may justify their inclusion in a list of modern British writers on the Atonement.

The chief value of the book is its convenient and reliable summaries and its critical appreciations, prefaced often by helpful introductions. It is true that Dr. Hughes offers what is described in the last chapter as a 'Constructive View,' but it is a slender contribution to the subject and tentative at the best. It should, however, be noted that in the course of the work he shows where his own sympathies lie. Speaking generally, we may say that he would base a theory of the Atonement on the nature of God as love, and would develop it on 'objective' rather than 'subjective' lines.

One point Dr. Hughes would make that imparts a certain individual tone to his reflections on this great doctrine. He is not quite content to say that it is in the nature of love to bear suffering for others, and to give itself for their sakes. He suggests that there was something more compelling in God than compassion for human need. Was not God, he asks, somehow involved and implicated in human sin and its consequences? Was not a certain sense of this in His moral consciousness? And was not His effort at Atonement an attempt to rectify a situation in which He felt implicated, and so find solace for His moral consciousness? It is a bold speculation, and Dr. Hughes puts it forth with hesitancy. But he would defend it on grounds of human experience and even seek to relate the sense of implication in God to the death of Christ by contending that Christ's absolute obedience even unto death may have brought about a change in the foundations and the realities of the moral world. Dr. Forsyth held to this idea, and Dr. Hughes would reinforce it by suggesting that the Atonement is but another illustration of the principle known to psychology as that of equilibrium: 'an effort of the moral universe, of which God is the author and ground, and in which He is active, to recover equilibrium after the disturbance caused by sin.' So that from this point of view the Atonement is a 'cosmic fact' in the deepest sense of the term.

W. Fulton.

JESUS AND THE KINGDOM.

A book deserving and rewarding close reading is *The Kingdom of God in the Experience of Jesus*, by Professor Emeritus S. H. Hooke, M.A., B.D., F.S.A. (Duckworth; 6s. net). It has the interest of showing what this Old Testament scholar sees as key-points for the understanding of the Gospels. Jesus, he says, 'started on His mission with certain general ideas derived from the prophetic and apocalyptic literature about the way the Kingdom might be expected to come; but as He faced the actual circumstances and accepted them as God's ordering, He was forced to break new ground, and directed into a course of action which was to issue in a totally new conception of the Kingdom and the manner of its coming.' All the same the book leaves the impression of Jesus working out His programme primarily by the guidance of the literature rather than by the constraint of immediate duties; and the author seems to lack interest in bringing into focus a living picture of Jesus in action.

His view of the career of Jesus is this. Beginning with genuine hopes of rapid success—here Professor Hooke does justice to the sincerity of the Galilean campaign — Jesus regarded the return of the Twelve from their preaching tour as marking its failure; and saw in John's death a token that He too must suffer and die, although His function in the Kingdom gave Him the assurance of Resurrection.

On the Cross He experienced the bitterness of separation from God, 'going down into hell and learning there in His own person what it was to need forgiveness.' Here the author tries hard to probe the ultimate meaning of the Cross. A criticism might be that the feeling of separation however agonizing, was an illusion that passed away before Jesus died with a sense of triumphant accomplishment and of peace with the Father.

The interest of the book lies most perhaps in its *obiter dicta* and its often novel exegesis. He rejects everything in the account of Jesus' baptism except what may be read as His own account of a spiritual experience. He does not believe that any of the Gospel explanations of the parables are genuine words of Jesus. He offers an original interpretation of 'the kingdom suffereth violence' taking the verb as middle rather than passive, and meaning 'bursts into energetic operation.' The 'least' in the kingdom of heaven should be 'one who is lesser,' that is to say, 'He Himself, lesser than John in popular estimation, is really greater because He is Messiah.' He takes the Parables of the Goodly Pearl, the Hid Treasure, and the Drag-net as a group referring to His own activity for the Kingdom, and the Parables of the Tares, the Mustard Seed and the Leaven as another group all descriptive of how the coming of the Kingdom goes awry through human evil. The barren fig-tree is Israel, and the curse on it was really a lament.

The opening and closing chapters about Divine kingship in ancient Society do not seem even to the author himself to have relevance to the rest of the book.

R. W. Stewart.

THE EARLY METHODIST PEOPLE.

Quite recently Dr. Leslie F. Church gave us an informative book, in which, founding solidly on first-hand sources, he let us see what manner of people the early Methodists were. And now there comes a second volume—*More About the Early Methodist People* (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). Sequels, as a rule, are disappointing. But this one holds the interest to the end. Here are tales of ugly and senseless persecution, sometimes simply silly, sometimes the outcome of wild and impossible rumours fiercely believed. When Charles Edward marched his troops to Derby in almost every town the Methodists were set upon as spies and traitors. Here, too, are thrilling stories of gallant social work among the most unlikely and unpromising folk, kindness to prisoners when no man cared for their souls or bodies, and to murderers, following them to the foot of the scaffold, often with surprising spiritual results. Above all, here is a vivid picture of religion in high flood. 'O God,' prayed a Psalmist, 'Let us see Thee in action.' The younger generation has not done so, must be tempted to imagine that what they see about them in this time of ebb is all that is to be expected, and to rest satisfied with that; has little understanding of how Christianity can leap from heart to heart, and set a whole people on fire.

But two things in this book impress one. And the first is that John Wesley, who to outsiders seems a domineering, even truculent, figure, was not nearly so authoritative among his own folk as is believed. The class meeting was his own creation. But, apart from that, the people had a great say in the gradual upbuilding of what is characteristically Methodist. Again and again Wesley gave way, or was convinced.

But what strikes one most is the lamentable tragedy whereby this people were forced out of the Church of England. This is, of course, the Methodist statement of the case; and there may be some answer to it, in whole or in part. Wesley himself had no wish to form a new denomination. At the Conference of 1749 it was laid down: 'In every place exhort those, who were brought up in the Church, constantly to attend its services. And in visiting the classes, ask every one, Do YOU go to Church as often as you ever did? Set the example yourself. Are we not unawares, by little and little, tending to a separation from the Church? O remove every tendency thereto with all diligence.'

It was with the utmost reluctance that Wesley, a great believer in the Sacraments, assented to the celebration of them in Methodist chapels. As late as 1829 Dr. Adam Clarke wrote: 'I have been a preacher in the Methodist Connexion more than half a century; and have been a travelling preacher forty-seven years, and I have ever found many people in most places of the Connexion very weary of not having the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper administered in our own chapels by our own preachers. Mr. J. Wesley MILDLY recommended the people to go to Church and Sacrament. Mr. C. Wesley threatened them with damnation if they did not.' And they did go. In Dublin Dr. Bernard 'explained the abnormally large Communion cups in use in St. Patrick's Cathedral by the fact that they had been specially made "to meet the emergency when the Methodists of former times came in a body to the Cathedral to make communion."' Difficulties were bound to arise; and they did. Multitudes were drawn in who had never had any connexion with the Church. Their own meetings were very dear to Methodists. There they had met Christ face to face; and there they wished to have the Sacrament. But it was the Church of England that shut the door. At the Universities Methodists were harassed and badgered. In many churches the Sacraments were denied to them. Charles Wesley himself had that experience. And so they gradually fell apart. Perhaps it was inevitable. But it seems sheer tragedy.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Round about sixty years ago the question of Paul's relation to Jesus was very much to the front. There were three positions taken up on the subject. The first was the traditional one, that the theology of Paul was, and is, the gospel and that it is the Divine interpretation of Jesus, just as it stands. The second was the opposite of this. Paul was a complete innovator. He was the inventor of traditional Christianity and perverted the simplicity of Jesus and His human message into a Judaic theology. The third position was that Paul had traces in his thought that are Judaic and that he owed something to Greece, at least in the forms of his thought, but that while the mould is to some extent due to Judaism and Hellenism the substance of Paul's thought was the Christian message and that there are no essential differences at all between Jesus and Paul. The whole question is discussed very thoroughly in an able volume, *The Meaning of Christ for Paul*, by the Rev. Elias Andrews (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $3.00). To what extent was Paul indebted to a pagan, a Jewish, a Greek background? What was his relation to Primitive Christianity? How far was he original? What is the gospel in Paul? These questions are searchingly examined by a capable scholar in a volume which contains a distinct contribution to the understanding of the Christology of Paul. His conclusions are on the whole orthodox, and he lays special emphasis on

the fact that in the end Paul's Christology is one of experience. It will repay students of divinity to work through this volume and examine for themselves the analysis the writer presents of Paul's thought.

It would be difficult to overvalue the debt which religious education owes to the 'Agreed Syllabuses.' Among these *The Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching for Schools* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net) holds a very high place. The third edition of this remarkable volume has been issued, and this edition has been completely revised in the light of experience and brought into line with the latest views. On its first appearance it created something like a sensation, it was so brilliantly conceived and promised so much for the improvement of 'divinity' teaching in the schools. It is good to know that it is extensively used, and if the teachers in our schools follow its guidance we may hope to see a generation arise that knows its Bible and has learned something of a reasonable Christianity. The book provides a complete syllabus of instruction at each stage, from the infants to the sixth form. But there are chapters of guidance for teachers on general but relevant religious topics, such as the language of the Bible, on history, legend and myth, on miracles and on the art of religious instruction. It may be interesting to add that the members of the Conference appointed to draw up the Syllabus include ten from the Authority, eight from the Church of England, eight from the Cambridge and District Free Church Federal Council, and fourteen teachers.

Two biographies of great missionaries have been issued, both impressive because of the qualities of the men concerned. One is *David Hill, Friend of China*, by the Rev. Harold B. Rattenbury, B.A. (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net). David Hill was one of the finest fruits of Methodism. His life was written some time ago by the Rev. W. T. Barber, D.D., and attracted widespread attention. It was a great missionary book and exerted a profound influence on many young people in the direction of the mission field. Recently, however, much new material, family records especially, was available, and the new life is the result. It is an inspiring book.

The other volume is *Successor to C. T. Studd*, by the Rev. Norman Grubb (Lutterworth Press; 6s. net) and it tells the story of Jack Harrison. He was for years a colleague of Studd, and, though lacking the background of that famous missionary, has been a worthy successor to his chief. And like the former book his biography is a powerful example of the greatness of the missionary cause. For both men were examples of that consecration and Divine simplicity which have done so much to spread the Kingdom of God over the world.

The Craft of Sermon Construction, by the Rev. W. Edwin Sangster, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), should interest clergy and lay preachers alike. It will appeal only to those who take preaching seriously and regard it as an essential and primary element in Divine Service. But to them it will give real help. A title like that of this book inevitably suggests a certain amount of self-satisfaction, but there is nothing of that here. Dr. Stalker, who in his time was a master of the art, said in his Yale Lectures on preaching: 'It is with no sense of having attained that I am to speak to you; for I always seem to myself to be only beginning to learn my trade; and the furthest I ever get in the way of confidence is to believe that I shall preach better next time.' There is something of that modesty here, but it is the modesty of one who knows. Dr. Sangster discusses in turn sermons classified according to subject matter, others according to structural type, those according to psychological method, and then the beginning of the sermon and its conclusion, further, methods of preparation, and finally common mistakes. In a sense and to some extent a preacher must find his own way here, but no sensible man will refuse the teaching of experience when laid down by one of the skilled. This is a useful book.

More than once Philip Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer and many another thing, set it down in black and white that 'it was the articles of a certain Samuel Edward Keeble, a Wesleyan minister, which were responsible for first turning my mind to socialism.' And that was typical of Keeble, a man who told upon his fellows, and got things done. A glowing account of him has now been published—*S. E. Keeble, Pioneer and Prophet*, by the Rev. Maldwyn Edwards, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 5s. net). It is the portrait of a likeable man, without a trace of envy in his composition and with other valuable characteristics. But what shaped his life was a searing horror of the social evils, and a determination that something must be done about them here and now. To this task he devoted himself with a one-idea'd zeal and an untiring energy; and, as one gathers, a dogmatism that could be pugnacious. Indeed, things would appear to have been made easier for this valiant fighter by the fact that it looks as if he lived in a flat world where things had only one side. Such a world is a dangerous place. And certainly, one thinks, Keeble was not always right in his passionately held beliefs.

Dante came upon a company of sorry folk so

neutral that heaven would have none of them, and even hell thrust them out. That fate could never fall to this colourful personality, who knew what he wanted, and gave his life to bringing it to pass. He lived to see some of his dreams come true. Whether the results as they mature would have proved as satisfying to him as he hoped, we do not know.

The Rev. Alan Walker, M.A., a practised and versatile writer on religious subjects, has published under the title *Christianity on the Offensive* (Epworth Press; 6s. net) a book of sermons preached in the Waverley Methodist Church, Sydney, Australia. He is persuaded that in recent years the door has swung wide open in a new way of opportunity for the Christian message, and that Christianity should once again take the offensive. And the point at which the Church to-day must carry conviction is on the question of the relevance of its message to the difficulties of personal living and the great problems of the hour. The sermons are clear and forcible utterances, and they have the special merit of containing many fresh and topical illustrations.

A Children's Life of Jesus, arranged by Mr. Arthur Mee (Hodder and Stoughton; 6s. net), will be a treasure in many households. In the words of a popular newspaper, 'a wonderful book to place in the hands of a child.' It is handsomely produced, well printed and illustrated by a series of pictures in full colour by Greta Jones, which add immensely to the attractiveness of the book. The story is in the words of Scripture and it is arranged under headings: The Childhood of Jesus, The Wonderful Things He Did, The Beautiful Things He Said, and The Last Days as told by each of the Evangelists. There are sub-headings which tell what each incident is about. And all this is printed as in any other gift book. This is how children should be introduced to the Bible. A real treasure.

The Beginnings of the Christian Church (Lutterworth Press; 21s. net), translated by the Rev. Bertram Lee Woolf, Ph.D., is the first volume, previously published in English but out of print for some time, and now extensively revised, of Hans Lietzmann's standard 'History of the Early Church.' Lietzmann has been for this generation what Harnack was for last, and teachers and students alike will welcome the reappearance in English of this his greatest work. The author combined a deep religious insight with a clear style, and was a great and versatile scholar. He died in Germany some six years ago. So thoroughly has the translator revised the text of the previous publication that this is virtually a new translation. The Editor of the Lutterworth Press has revised the Bibliography for English readers and added some works that have appeared since 1937, the date of the first translation. The scope of the work should appear from the fact that it has early chapters on John the Baptist and Jesus and that it concludes with chapters on Ignatius, Marcion, and Gnosticism.

The Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter, a well-known evangelical preacher, has written a book with the title, *Studies in Problem Texts* (Marshall, Morgan, and Scott; 9s. 6d. net), which he further elucidates in a sub-title, 'Being a short series of elucidatory and applicatory expositions of certain Scripture passages which have occasioned perplexity.' There are obscure passages in the Bible that invite research and thought, and there are others that are difficult only on the surface and occasion no trouble to common sense. Both these types are found in this series of sermons. The really difficult are such as these: The Unpardonable Sin, 'Whosesoever Sins Ye remit,' 'The Rock Which Followed.' But the others, such as 'Must We Hate for Christ's Sake?', 'Does Jesus Draw All Men?' if not really obscure, are excellent subjects for exposition. In both cases and in all his subjects Mr. Baxter finds occasion for his genius for exposition, and one can safely say that this book is an excellent example of expository preaching.

When the Shadyside Church in Pittsburgh, following the admirable American practice, gave its minister, the Rev. Hugh Thomson Kerr, D.D., a sabbatical year, he took the opportunity of looking over his sermons. The only ones that were fresh and preachable were his talks to children. Hence a collection of these in *Children's Everyland Story-Sermons* (Oliphants; 6s. net). The cover contains a tribute from Dr. James Black, himself a noted preacher to children: 'Hugh Kerr is one of the best writers of children's sermons I know. What sane, interesting, and direct talks he gives to his boys and girls.' There is no need to add anything to that.

The Radiant Orb (W. J. Parrett, Sittingbourne; 12s. 6d. net), by Mr. L. Wyatt Lang, M.A., purports to be a Psychological Study of Jesus of Nazareth. It is a book that undoubtedly shows psychological interests and insights, but one is apt to be prejudiced against it from the outset by its description of the 'German point of view' in Biblical criticism as that 'theories, when they appear to be plausible, must be regarded as true in fact.' One is also apt to be further prejudiced against the book when its central contention is

found to be that the 'radiant orb' (the phrase was used by Lord Nelson with a psychological meaning) in the life of Jesus was the Divine message to His mother. The author's point of view and style appear in the following: 'There have been and will be countless "orbs" radiating in the lives of human beings, but there has been only one of such brilliant radiance as came to a girl in her small home in Nazareth. Yet the description of the scene does not suggest that the angel came with overwhelming magnificence or gave his message with an awe-inspiring grandeur. The angel entered the room unannounced and delivered the message with reverence but not with despotic insistency. He answered the maiden's question and awaited her simple acquiescence in the glorious rôle of human mother of a Divine Son.' An appendix contains the 'life-lines' of W. H. Hudson, Mary Anne Galton, Charles Darwin, and Sundar Singh, as well as a psychological description of 'The Browning Love Letters.' It is a pity the book contains many mis-spellings.

Most readers, we imagine, will find Dr. William Allison Shimer's book, *Conscious Clay* (Scribners; 10s. 6d. net), rather like the curate's egg. Some things are well said, and the chapter on the Love of God deserves the epithet 'beautiful.' But the book as a whole raises more questions than it professes to answer. To begin with, the volume contains too much. Too many topics are dealt with, and the rapid reader will suffer from mental dyspepsia. The author's aim is to base himself on science, and by way of philosophy come to religion. Why in that large enough field he should discuss wit, humour, and tragedy, is not very clear. Then his philosophy can hardly be conceived as likely to do anything but confuse and perplex. It is a kind of pan-animism and pan-psychism. Our everyday distinctions between animate and inanimate, conscious and non-conscious are baseless. Clay is conscious. All that exists is alive and conscious. If this be so, the animal slaughtered by the butcher is alive and conscious. Surely, it may be objected, it is neither alive nor conscious in the same sense as it was the moment before the butcher acted. All things, according to the author, are just names of electro-magnetic energy. So is God. God is the All. He is Creator only in the sense of a demiurge who is working out His creative activities and purposes by rearranging the material which is as eternal as Himself. It is not made clear how exactly God distinguished Himself out of the total electro-magnetic energy of which He is part.

The writer is deeply religious, and thinks that his philosophy will give greater assurance to enquirers on ethical and religious topics. He regards Christianity as on the whole the best religion 'as yet' attained; but thinks that all religions have something of value to contribute to the religion which will ultimately unite mankind.

Lives of the Prophets: A Thousand Years of Hebrew Prophecy reviewed in its Historical Context, by the Rev. Stephen L. Caiger, M.A., B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net), is a revised and enlarged edition of a work which was published in 1936 and of which the remaining stocks were destroyed during the bombing of London. Mr. Caiger has taken this opportunity of writing chapters on the 'pre-writing' prophets. He asks his readers 'to take it on trust that the assured results of Biblical research have not been ignored,' though there is little in the new chapters to indicate this. On the 'Writing Prophets' he says that 'we shall take their (*sc.* the Higher Critics') point of view for granted, and merely try to build up a coherent edifice from the loose stones they have left lying about, using perhaps a little imagination for mortar, and a certain freedom of choice where doctors disagree.' This sentence indicates where Mr. Caiger's real interests lie, namely in the field of archæology, and one senses a certain impatience with criticism, the criticism which perhaps he learned a generation ago. What we begin to need rather badly is popular books on the prophets written from the standpoint of criticism which is really up-to-date. The difficulty is for those who are competent to do it to find the time. The harvest should be plenteous, but the labourers are few.

Books on Christian Ethics have been appearing in unusual numbers in recent years. It serves to counterbalance the unusual number of books on Christian Dogmatics that have been appearing. Perhaps it is not for nothing that the conservative movement in doctrine has been accompanied by a progressive movement in the matters of life and conduct. We note here the appearance under the title, *An Outline of New Testament Ethics* (University of London Press; 8s. 6d. net), of a very useful exposition, systematic, scholarly, and in popular style, of the moral teaching of Christianity as it is to be gathered from the Gospels and the Pauline and other Epistles. The author is the Rev. Canon Lindsay Dewar, M.A., B.D., Principal of Bishops' College, Cheshunt. He hopes that his book will be used not only by 'clergymen, ministers and theological students' but also by all Christians who desire a better understanding of the nature of Christian morality. It may be added that the author does not forget to emphasize the importance of Christian belief as the basis and root of Christian life and conduct.

Interpreted by Love.

By the Right Reverend J. W. Hunkin, D.D., Bishop of Truro.

All Christians would admit a concern for the spread of Truth. If we were asked to define precisely the meaning of the word *truth* we should be much at a loss. But we all have at least a rough idea of what we mean by it, and for the purpose of this article I shall use the word *truth* to denote *an accurate mental picture of reality*, reality being assumed to be a coherent whole, an orderly system into which things and forces fit. What we seek is not merely a picture of the superficial sequence of events but of the reasons why they happen ; of the inner working of things, with some clear idea of their ultimate nature and meaning.

Now what we find is that the pursuit of truth in this sense leads us on every side into a cloud of mystery. We have passed the period of Mr. H. G. Wells—the cocky period (as it has been called) of the human spirit. Thoughtful men are troubled and deeply puzzled. The universe is far more complicated than was thought seventy years ago. The stars of first-class magnitude are inconceivably many—perhaps one for every grain of sand on all the shores of all the oceans of the world. Why there should be so many we cannot imagine. And as for the atom—I asked one of the greatest living authorities not long ago if he could with his mind's eye picture an atom, and he said ' not in the very least.' For my degree I studied Mathematics, but I am fonder of Botany, and what reduces me to speechless amazement is the intense activity of Nature—of the living cell and of all the organic and inorganic action that is going on unceasingly every moment. At the complexity of the Universe our minds boggle. The Universe repels our attempt to understand it and drives us back into ourselves. After all, man himself is highest in the scale of the creatures within the manifold of Nature. Is there any principle within man's own personal experience which may prove to illuminate and interpret the Universe as a whole ?

When I was reading Mathematics the subject which I found hardest to understand was Hydrodynamics. Here we were introduced to what was called the *velocity potential*, and we found it highly interpretive of motion in a fluid. Is there anything in man himself which is interpretive of the Universe ? What is the most significant of all our personal experiences ? I have no hesitation in answering that question by the one word *Love*. But by Love I do not mean a mere emotion. Love includes emotion but much more than emotion. It is a sentiment in the sense in which Dr. Alexander Shand uses the word in his great book, *The Foundations of Character* : a sentiment, *i.e.*, a whole complex of mental conditions and activities, a whole system of ideas, impulses and feelings centred round the idea of the loved object. But I need not attempt to define Love. We all know what it is—not fully indeed, but a little. The design of the Universe appears to include a plan whereby all normal human beings are introduced into the experience of Love, are given a taste of Love. Now I believe that whereas the Marthas of Philosophy are careful and troubled about many difficult and abstruse principles, few are needful or even one (Lk 10[42]) ; and that one is the one chosen by the Mary of Religion : the principle of Love. That, I am convinced, takes us closer to the secret of this mysterious Universe than any other.

Far the most illuminating single idea which we can have of the great origin of all that is, the ground of all being, Creator, Author, Sustainer, Unmoved Mover . . . God, is that *God is Love*. That gives us the principle in its theoretical aspect. Apply it to the Universe and see what a depth of meaning it reveals. Take the principle in its practical aspect and apply it to human life here and now. Adopt the attitude of love *i.e.*, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor said, *friendship to all mankind*, active goodwill to everybody, and see how it works.

But my argument leads further. Love is precisely what Religion puts at the apex of its teaching and practice. *Amor Dei*, the love of God, is the highest conception of the mystical and devotional writers. And some of them have been not only mystics but great leaders of action : Bernard of Clairvaux, for example, one of the dominating personalities in Europe in the twelfth century, and one of his books was *On the Love of God*.

And love of man—active love, doing to others as we would be done by—is recognized by Religion, and especially by the Christian Religion, as the fundamental principle of morality. But when we observe that Religion is so right about this supreme conception of Love, that observation must incline us to a favourable, expectant attitude towards Religion, which in practice for us here in England must mean the Christian Religion.

The Christian Religion is carried down from generation to generation by a great society which recognizes Christ as its Head. In spite of all the modern talk about equality, for a great enterprise

you need a living Head. As a living Head Christ is incomparable. His life on earth was short. That March day in the year A.D. 29 when He was crucified should, according to all human calculations, have seen the last of Him. But it did not. Peter and the group around him were completely convinced that their Lord had triumphed over death. In that conviction they continued to the end of their lives. They expected Him to return on the clouds of heaven. He did not return ; and again on all human reckoning the society should quickly have died out. But it did not die out. In three hundred years it had conquered the Roman Empire—at least to this extent, that when the Empire fell the Christian Religion on its ruins built up Western Civilization as we know it to-day. And the Christian Church, Christ's great society, is still alive and vigorous. Not so vigorously alive as we should like to see it, and much hampered by its divisions. Never mind, a number of these divisions have real life in them. Take for instance 'the pure and reformed part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church established in this kingdom' (as the Cambridge Bidding Prayer calls it). Think of its thousands of lovely and sacred buildings, of its wonderful music, of its incomparable Book of Common Prayer and of the magnificent Authorised Version of the Bible. Are we not drawn towards one branch or other of Christ's great Church ? Not merely towards, but right in : right into practising membership. If only the Church can be true to its own fundamental principle of Love ! Among the Churches' leaders there are the Marthas, careful and troubled about many points of doctrine and ritual and behaviour. Yet few things are needful or one—the great Principle of Charity, *i.e.*, Love. 'I will not break the certain Law of Charity for doubtful doctrine,' one of the great Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century used to say. In the Early Church the fire of friendship burned brightly. Here, for example, is a note which St. Paul added to one of his letters :

> 'I commend to you Phœbe, who is one of our brotherhood, a helper in the Church at Cenchreae, that you may give her the welcome that Christians give to one another, and help her in any business for which she asks your aid. She has herself stood by many and has stood by me' (Ro $16^{1.2}$).

That is genuine authentic Christianity and we must revive it. We must as Christians recover that eager readiness to spring to one another's assistance. The Church is in intention the fellowship of the friendship of Christ, and if the Church can live up to its intention it will indeed be the rallying point which mankind needs.

Mankind does need a rallying point. The Principle of Love illumines and interprets the Universe, but it still leaves many problems as yet unexplained : above all the problem of evil. We cannot shut our eyes to the problem, or pretend that it doesn't exist. In the remarkable lectures on History recently given by Professor Herbert Butterfield in the Third Programme of the B.B.C. the Professor spoke of a 'gravitational pull in human nature which draws the highest things downwards, mixes them with earth, and taints them with human cupidity.' 'It is essential,' he says, 'not to have faith in human nature. Such faith is a comparatively recent heresy and a very disastrous one.' I should not really take Professor Butterfield's words out of their context, but all history so far shows up not only man's occasional flashes of greatness but his besetting faults and failings. The world needs redemption, and the great redeeming force is Love. As things actually are, punishment has to operate like a surgeon's knife cutting out corruption and making room for healing influence. The positive healing influence is provided by Love. The hope of the world is that mankind should respond to the Love of God by loving Him in return and extending their love to all His children, their fellow human beings, members of His one family. This is the ideal that is set before us, and the fellowship of the Christian Church offers the encouragement and inspiration which we all need if we are sincerely pressing towards that ideal.

We are living in a period of revolution. So was Jude, the author of that tiny Epistle placed in the New Testament just before the Book of Revelation. He writes vehemently against corrupt revolutionaries who are teaching lax morals and fantastic theology : 'filthy dreamers,' he calls them, who 'despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.' Revolution to-day is not altogether free from corruption of a similar sort. And what does Jude recommend to Christians in such circumstances ? There is one lovely phrase in $v.^{21}$, 'Keep yourselves in the love of God'—'. . . praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God' : the one thing needful, that good part, Mary's choice, in contrast with all the over-anxious Marthas in the world.

Doctrine of Man.

The Divine Image in Man.

By the Reverend Principal H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D., Bristol.

The question, 'What is Man?' says Emil Brunner, 'is the point at which the passionate interest of men and the divine message of the Bible meet and come into conflict' (*Man in Revolt*, 9). It is certainly the point at which a secularist humanism must come out into the open against the Christian gospel. Such a philosophy, regarding Christian dogma as an arbitrary gloss upon a mystical experience which has no need of the theistic hypothesis, may nevertheless speak with the greatest respect of religion and even accord a considerable pragmatic value to the idea of God. But when it comes to an estimate of man and his place in the universe, what common ground can there be between those who maintain, as Christians do, that God has made man in His image, and those who maintain that it is man who has made God in his own? Yet the Christian view can allow for the truth in secularist estimates of man. While 'economic man,' for example, is not the real man but only an aspect of him, Christians should welcome the stress which is now being laid on the influence of economic factors on human thinking and behaviour. We shall never have done with the errors of Marxist philosophy until we have assimilated the truth it has to teach us. And so with other anthropologies. What they profess to give us is the whole truth about man. This is their error, and here they must be resisted. But they do give us a part of the truth about him, although it is only within the context of the Christian view of man that the part takes its rightful subordinate place in the whole and makes its contribution to our understanding of ourselves and our society. The assertion that man makes God in his own image is a case in point. Let this stand for the whole truth about man and his religion, and you have a proposition that simply contradicts the Christian estimate. Yet, within the wider context of that Christian estimate, the assertion is true. For man the sinner *does* make God in his own image. It is his sin that he does so, and the god he fashions is an idol. So, far from contradicting, it brings confirmation of the sombre truth that man as we know him is 'fallen'—alienated from the God in whose image he was created.

'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him' (Gn 1^{27}). What does this mean? The *imago Dei* here signalizes man's pre-eminence among the creatures and dominion over them, which is also the theme of Ps 8. This special dignity belongs to man as man, and there is no suggestion that it has been forfeited by the Fall. Now while the New Testament carries over the conception of the *imago Dei* as man's dominion over the creatures, it sounds another note also. Man's likeness to God is now interpreted ethically and religiously. Man has a unique place in the creation in that he has been made for fellowship with God. He has been called to sonship. He is to be holy as God is holy, and it is in this moral likeness to God that the *imago Dei* is chiefly seen. But it is precisely this moral likeness that has been lost by man's sin and can be restored only in Jesus Christ, the Second Adam. Already the paradox at the heart of this doctrine makes its appearance. Man the sinner both bears and does not bear the image of God.

The first attempt to resolve this paradox was to distinguish between the two senses in which the *imago Dei* is used in the Bible; and to say that while man by his sin loses his moral likeness to God, he retains his rationality and that dominion over the lower creation which it confers on him. This is substantially the view of Irenæus, and after him of Catholic theology. It was based on an exegesis of Gn 1^{26}: '*Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.*' Unlike man's rationality and freedom, which belong to his nature as created by God (*imago*), man's moral likeness to God and his immortality (*similitudo*) are supernatural—a gift proffered to man by the gracious God, but rejected by man in his disobedience and thereafter withdrawn. Now although this distinction is exegetically untenable, it is an honest attempt to grapple with the paradox that in fallen man the *imago Dei* both is and is not lost. Yet the attempt is unsuccessful. The *imago Dei* which remains after the Fall turns out to be identical with the nature of man according to Greek philosophy. Man the sinner is still the same *ens rationale* that God created. His sin has forfeited his supernatural inheritance but has not impaired his humanity. But this is to ignore the unity of man, which persists even when he is a sinner. For it does not take account of the fact—which must not be lost sight of for a moment—that man the sinner is still 'before God.' The *ens rationale* is not 'before God,' because the God who creates a morally

neutral rationality is the deist's God and not the living God of the Bible. And the supernatural gift of the *similitudo*, whereby man was 'set before God' and destined to be in the Divine presence for ever, has now been lost. In other words, what the distinction between *imago* and *similitudo* fails to express is that *unique relationship* of man to God whereby man is a son even while he is a sinner, and accountable as a sinner just because he is a son.

No advance toward a true interpretation of the *imago Dei* can be made until the historicity of the Fall story is frankly given up. Not only is this required by intellectual honesty, but, as Brunner has argued with great cogency, a sound theology demands its abandonment. Speculation concerning the 'primitive state' of man has too long deflected theological reasonings. What primitive man was like is not a question on which the Bible gives us any special information. Nor indeed does it encourage us to inquire, as though we needed to know the answer to the question before we could proceed to a doctrine of the *imago Dei*. As for the Fall, *we* are Adam, both as individuals and as members of the human race. We have 'fallen.' But we need spend no time in slaying the slain. Suffice it to say that if we are still to believe in a historical Fall we have no way of bringing home to our contemporaries the extreme seriousness and guilt of sin. For it is true in the last resort that, according to the traditional theory of the Fall, Adam is the only sinner. The rest of us are 'not responsible.' And this idea of responsibility—which is the very foundation of the Christian doctrine of man—must not be encumbered with a view of the Fall that not all the refinements and hair-splittings of scholastic theologians can clear of the charge of being deterministic. Brunner is unusually emphatic about this.[1] To be a man means to be *responsible*.

And now let us take this idea of responsibility as the guiding line in our attempt to re-state the doctrine of the *imago Dei*. Remember that it is a paradox we are trying to express. In man as we know him the image of God has been lost—and yet has not been lost. That it has been lost is clear. Man by his sin has broken fellowship with God, and by no effort of his own can restore it. He must be 'saved by grace,' and in Christ is his only hope of the renewal of the Divine image in him. On the other hand, it is just as clear that the image of God in him has not been lost. For he is a sinner. And a sinner he could not be, bearing the guilt of his sin and the responsibility of it, unless even here and now he stood before God and remained within that unique relationship in which God created him. For to lose the image of God would be to cease to be human.[2] Now it is only too easy to resort here to the distinction between rationality and righteousness, and to say that while man has lost his righteousness his rationality remains. But apart from the objections we have already mentioned, there is no need to distinguish between rationality and righteousness; responsibility embraces them both. The truth about man as we know him is not expressed when we say that he is rational any more than when we say that he is righteous. To say that he is righteous is to say too much. He is destined to righteousness; Christ is his righteousness—these things can be said. Yet man as we know him is unrighteous and unreconciled. And to call him rational is to say too little. For we have said nothing about his unique relationship to God, which is what we are trying to express in our doctrine of *imago Dei*. But to say that man is responsible is to say that he is rational and also that he is righteous (or unrighteous).

The *imago Dei*, therefore, refers to the unique relationship in which man has been created and in which he stands to his Creator. The Scriptural basis for the doctrine is not to be sought so much in those passages (few enough) in which the phrase expressly occurs as in the idea of the Covenant which Yahweh makes with Israel His son. For Israel is Yahweh's son by adoption; the Covenant is a covenant of grace. And the key-words here are grace on God's side and faith on man's. If we are to use sub-personal analogies man is to God as the lock is to the key. And discarding such analogies we may say that the *imago Dei* is to be found in the human act that answers to the Divine act—the response which, though free, bears in its very nature clear evidence that it is and can only be a response to *this* Divine love—*this* word of grace.

To be created in the image of God means that man is a responsible creature, a creature capable of making a response to Divine love. To that which unites man to the rest of creation—his finitude, his creatureliness—is added that which marks him off as unique among his fellow creatures—and it is this that is signalized by the *imago Dei*. Yet we must beware of speaking as though the image of God were a higher storey built over the ground floor of creatureliness. This would be to make the same mistake we have already condemned in the *imago-similitudo* version of the

[1] Brunner's treatment of our subject in *Man in Revolt* is a model of theological writing in its penetration and clarity.

[2] The Reformers recognized this. Although in opposition to the Catholic doctrine they identified the *imago Dei* with the *justitia originalis* and taught that this had been utterly lost by the Fall, they were constrained to bring back a 'relic' of the image to account for the rationality still remaining in man the sinner.

doctrine. It is not true that man is an animal *plus*. For this would mean that the loss of the Divine image would leave his animality unaffected. This does not happen. Even man's animal nature, in so many ways akin to that of the beasts, is none the less decisively different from theirs. Man the sinner may sink into bestiality, but in him bestiality is sin—something of which the beasts are incapable. An animal, living according to its God-given instincts, is never bestial. For bestiality is degraded animality, and its root is not in man's animal instincts and propensities but in that sin which gives free rein to these so that they are disordered as an animal's never are. Sin is a human act, and it involves the whole man, his animality and rationality alike. And the essence of sin is man's refusal of his responsibility before God.

Now if we identify the *imago Dei* with man's responsibility before God we have to be on our guard against certain misunderstandings to which modern man is specially prone. Is it really true, for example, that no responsibilities are binding on us except those we have freely chosen to accept? What *is* true is that choice and freedom are of the essence in this matter of responsibility. But we tend to put the cart before the horse. If I join a tennis club, I accept certain responsibilities. I bind myself to pay my subscription and keep the rules of the club. But I need not join the club, and I am free to resign my membership and divest myself of its responsibilities whenever I choose. But in this higher matter of being a man am I to say that, since I did not choose to be born, I have no responsibility? Shall I regard all these responsibilities that devolve on me as a rational being as so many limitations and fetters on a freedom that ought to be mine?

According to the Christian gospel we find ourselves to be bearers of responsibilities we did not choose and standing in a relationship to God that cannot be abolished even by our sin. We find ourselves to be dependent on God as creatures on their Creator—we are finite. But unlike other creatures it is given to us—not indeed to choose whether we will stand in this relation to God or outside it but to choose whether we will offer our finitude and our creaturely dependence to God in love and trust and obedience, or whether we will resent what we cannot resist and set ourselves in futile rebellion against responsibility we cannot escape. For we *are* responsible, and so far as the *imago Dei* is identified with our responsibility to God it is clear that the Image can never be lost. It is because it cannot be lost that our sin is really sin. Neither a thing nor an animal can sin but only a *person*, a responsible being. Sin is a concept that is meaningless outside of this relationship of responsibility. In strictness only sons can sin against the Heavenly Father. Did they forfeit their sonship by sinning and become beasts, could they resign their high dignity and divest themselves of their responsibility, then not only would they cease to be sinners; they would cease to exist. But man cannot in this sense commit suicide. By no rebellion or infidelity can he withdraw himself from God's presence, so as to cease to exist 'before God.' He is at all times and in all circumstances 'responsible'—in a relationship to God which he did not choose and which he is not free to abolish, but which by God's grace he may choose in response to God's choice of him. He may be free within it; he cannot be free from it. And to be free within it is to be free indeed. Man's freedom is freedom in responsibility; in the response he makes to God's sovereign grace.

It is easy to see why men are in revolt against the doctrine of Divine sovereignty. That doctrine lends itself to caricature wherever its exponents lose sight of the unique relationship that is indicated by the phrase *imago Dei*. Think of God as the Divine Potter and man as the clay, and at once man's rebellion against his Creator takes on a spurious Promethean nobility. 'Prometheus did right to rebel against Zeus of the thunderbolts. But the case is altered if we rebel against the God of grace, whose insignia is not a thunderbolt but the Cross. When we rebel against God we are rebelling against love and goodness and against our own true selves. For we have been created by Divine goodness in order that we may find our supreme blessedness in eternal fellowship with that goodness. Our love, our trust and our freedom flourish in that benign air and wither in our self-imposed exile from it. Our freedom, for example, is not acceptance of necessity, but our response to grace. And the supreme, essential human activity is neither rational thought nor ethical choice but *worship*. And who and what man is may not be known until we penetrate beneath his foolish idolatries and the lumber of his false gods to the God who created him and the true worship in which alone man is really man.

How do we know that we are made in God's image? How do we know that we are sinners, in whom that image, though not destroyed, has been distorted, so that *we* can never restore it, or by any labour of our own put right what is wrong in our creaturely relationship to God? How do we come to understand that our relationships to our fellow-men and to the created world of Nature are wrong because we are not reconciled to God? The answer to all these questions is that we know these things in Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word. In Him we know the God whose grace we have refused. And in Him we know ourselves to be

sinners, members of a sinful race, and strangers in a world that ought to be our home, since it is our Father's house. But in Him, and Him alone, we see clearly that image of God in which we were made and in which we are to be re-created. And it is in Christ that we are re-created in that image. For God in Christ reconciles us to Himself and through His Holy Spirit puts right what is wrong in our relationship to Him by giving us *faith*. For as our sin is the refusal of grace, so faith is the glad acceptance of our responsibility before God. As sin is the false freedom that issues in bondage, frustration, and death, so faith is that filial love and obedience that issue in true freedom and life abounding. As our sin is our idolatry and the degradation of our humanity, so our faith is our true worship and our real manhood. For faith is the root of holiness which the Spirit plants and tends in man; it is the image of God in us until faith shall give place to the beatific vision and 'we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Lighthouse.

By the Reverend A. Kingsley Turner, M.A., Greenford.

'For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'—1 Co 3^{11} (R.V.).

In August 1492 three ships set out from the port of Palos in Spain and sailed ever westward into the unknown Atlantic until their crews feared they would never see their native land again. When hope was almost given up, and the sailors were on the verge of mutiny, land was sighted, and Christopher Columbus became the first European to set foot in the West Indies. For two months he cruised around the islands until his best ship was wrecked on the island of Haiti; then, leaving a small garrison behind, he sailed back to tell the amazing news of his discovery. To celebrate the five hundredth anniversary of his birth a lighthouse is to be built on the reef where the 'Santa Maria' was lost; all the nations of Central America are joining in this great enterprise, and already some of you may have seen its design on South American stamps.

The lighthouse will be a beacon for ships and aircraft, but will also be a museum for everything associated with Columbus, and each of the Central American republics will have its own room in the museum.

Four hundred and fifty-five architects from all over the world competed for the honour of erecting it, and the prize went to an Englishman, Mr. J. L. Gleaves, whose design was the strangest lighthouse anyone had seen. All the rest planned a towering sky-scraper, but he designed a flat building with a low tower which did not look a bit like a lighthouse; yet it was this curious design that was chosen for two very good reasons.

Firstly, he alone had allowed for the climate! The West Indies are subject to earthquakes, and a high tower might not be safe, and so Mr. Gleaves' tower was short enough to withstand the shocks. The other plans were like so many of the dreams which people have about the future—they sound very fine, but will not stand up to the climate. Sometimes a boy or girl dreams of what they want to do when they grow up, but their dreams often do not come true because of some fault in their characters; they may be lazy or careless and their grand plans are never carried out. Many wonderful plans for a new world have been drawn up; they sound so fine that we expect to have a better world in a few years' time, but they will not stand up against the shocks of selfishness and greed. There is only one kind of plan which will do this, and the lighthouse once again helps us to see which that is; for the second reason why Mr. Gleaves won the prize was that from the air his lighthouse looked like a cross. He designed it to commemorate the religion which Columbus brought to the New World and to symbolize the peace which the nations seek to maintain.

It is through the Cross that our selfishness and laziness and all the other sins which hinder us are overcome; Christianity must be the basis of our own lives and of the society in which we live. Through Jesus Christ we can live together in peace, and our New World will be His Kingdom. So Paul tells the Corinthians that there can be no other foundation for life except that which is laid in Christ Jesus.

And so the new lighthouse becomes a parable for us; as it sends out its great beams across the sea it will guide sailors and airmen to safety, but as men look at its shape it will remind them that only through Jesus Christ can men find their real safety, which is the salvation which He brings.

It's The Take-Off That Counts.

By the Reverend G. E. Benfield, M.A., H.C.F., Chippenham.

How excited were the people who watched the Brabazon on her taxying trials when they saw the great machine actually begin to ' take off.' All of us who heard the news shared the excitement. So, you may be sure, did the crew when their machine actually became airborne for the first time.

The ' take-off ' is the most exciting part of travel by air, from the passenger's point of view, I consider. When I first climbed into an aircraft—it was a Beaufighter in Burma—I found myself wondering what it would feel like to travel through the sky at more than two hundred miles per hour—very thrilling I anticipated. But strangely enough, once the aircraft was well and truly flying through the sky, it all felt most unexciting; there was hardly any sensation of speed at all. It was like bowling along in a very slow sort of taxi-cab. Slower than that, indeed, for the earth was so far away that we seemed hardly to be moving at all. To my great surprise, I found that I was actually getting rather bored with my air trip after an hour, and, so far from feeling excited, was actually nodding.

Now, are you who are hoping to fly one day disappointed or relieved at this ? I have travelled by air many times since then, and there is one part of the trip that I always have found exciting—and just a wee bit alarming sometimes. That is the ' take-off.' Imagine you are in the aircraft about to start. You have fastened your safety straps and the pilot has taxied the plane slowly to the end of the runway. He ' revs up ' each of the engines in turn to test it. And you listen rather anxiously to see if you can detect a false note. Then the machine begins to move, slowly at first, but with increasing speed—twenty, forty, eighty miles per hour. Sheds and trees beside the run-way flash past you, and the uncomfortable thought suggests itself, ' Supposing we were to bump into one of these obstacles while careering along the ground at this speed ? ' The plane is roaring along like an express train gone wild and you are just having another uncomfortable thought, ' Supposing it just ran straight off the run-way, supposing it were too heavy to get off the ground ? Was it a ditch or a ploughed field that lay beyond the run-way . . . ? ' Then suddenly comes a delicious feeling. You are rising and the earth is slowly, gently dropping away beneath you, as you mount smoothly up into the sky. You find yourself breathing much more easily, you loosen your safety-belt, and you settle back comfortably as the aircraft proceeds on its way.

The ' take-off ' is exciting—and all-important; and difficult. Do you know that it takes twice as much power to get an aircraft off the ground as it does to keep it flying through the air ? And this is true of much else in life, too—the ' take-off ' is difficult and counts tremendously. Can you remember the day when you first started school, and the mingled excitement and apprehension that marked the occasion ? Yet after a short time you grew accustomed to it and it all seemed perfectly normal and natural. Much the same is true about starting work after school, and about many other of life's experiences. But it is specially true of the Christian life. To start with it seems difficult, even strange. Indeed, it needs a lot of power to get us started at all—lots of determination and courage, all our strength of will and all the help of God's Spirit. But once we have made that tremendous effort and really got started, despite all difficulties and the temptations that hold us back, why then we find ourselves going along as easily and as naturally as an aircraft flying through the sky, and we realize that this sort of life, the life of courage and purity and faith and love is the very life we were meant to live. Remember that your Sunday school and church are there specially to help you with the start of the Christian life. For they know how important the ' take-off ' is and how it counts.

A Prayer of Remembrance and for Peace.

Almighty and Everlasting God,
as we recall the tragedy and triumph,
the misery and heroism of war,
and keep honoured and inviolate
the memorials of the dead,
we thank Thee for their courage and devotion.
May their memory inspire us who cherish it
to live for and hold dear all good things
that they defended and hoped to make sure.

O God of whom it is written,
' He woundeth and His hands make whole,'
Look in love on parents, widows, lovers, friends
in whose hearts dear memories are still alive,
and private pride and sorrow.
Let no agony or ache
break or master their spirit.
Grant them a reverent and consoling expectation
of the consummation of Thy purpose of good,
in which every sacrifice shall be justified,
and all tears be dried,
in the company of the redeemed,
in the felicity of Thine everlasting kingdom.

Hear our intercession
for those broken in mind or body or estate,
still bearing the mark of suffering.
Move us to pay the debt we owe to those
whose sacrifice was beyond the common measure.

Hear our vows, who returned or never went,
that we will seek to harvest for mankind
the seed sown in blood and tears.
Grant us a vision of high and hopeful things
that we may do together.
Give us the diligence and sincerity needed
to make fine ideas and dreams realities.
Purge our minds from foolish arrogance,
our hearts from ruthlessness and hate.
Enable men to discern the pattern
of that which Thou dost will and sanction,
and so make peace holy and glorious.
And to God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit
shall be praise for evermore.
AMEN.

The Christian Year.

ADVENT SUNDAY.

Declaring the Truth.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,
CATHCART, GLASGOW.

'By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.'—2 Co 4^2.

Here is the Apostle Paul defending himself. His accusers have charged him with meddling with the integrity of the gospel. He has distorted it, cunningly disguised it to suit his own ends, cleverly adulterated it so that his dupes might be deceived by his fawning speech and professions of disinterestedness. So his traducers allege. But Paul's conscience is clear. He rebuts the false charges, exposes the coarse calumny and declares, 'I state the truth openly and commend myself to every man's conscience in the sight of God.'

If Paul is unassailable, who among us would claim to be? We all shift uneasily in our places as we listen to the voices of his accusers. The temptation is always present and very strong to make the gospel less and other than it really is.

The truth we have to proclaim sometimes seems to us fierce and uncompromising. We want to win our brothers for it, but how can we expect them to accept such high doctrine? It is too much for them. So we moderate its apparent extravagances. We soft-pedal its exorbitant claims, smooth out its roughness and refine its crudities. 'After all,' we say, as we justify ourselves, 'we do not feed babies on strong meat, but on milk.' We must treat people as we find them, suiting the gospel to their circumstances and accommodating it to their stage of development.' That is true. We must use discrimination and discernment in commending Christ to our brothers, but we must be wary. The process is dangerous and the temptations are subtle. We may so modify the gospel that we blur its distinctiveness, so tone down the challenge that shatters man's complacency that it is no longer the faith of our fathers, the saving word that has changed men and nations but another gospel. 'I state the truth openly,' says Paul. No modifications. No reservations. 'Jesus Christ and him crucified.'

See what we can so easily do to the faith. Men to-day boggle at the supernaturalism of the gospel. It runs entirely contrary to the lines set for their thinking by our modern scientific training. 'I can get on all right with the teaching of Jesus,' said a doctor to me the other day, 'but His miracles stump me.' So what? Well, before we know it we have patted our friend on the shoulder and assured him that after all the miracles do not matter very much and perhaps a careful examination of our differing terminology would reveal that we really basically mean the same thing. Thus we modify the gospel.

Or men to-day recoil from belief in a personal God. Describe God as a Cause, or a Force, or the Something-that-makes-for-righteousness, and they are with us, but speak in the language of the New Testament and call Him our Father and we pull up their thinking to a dead stop. It is too big, too complicated, too terrible a world for a Heavenly Father to preside over. Therefore we resume thinking by using the same language as they do and speak of the Creator as a Primary Cause or a Life Force. God is immediately impersonalized and we have destroyed the essence of the message we seek to commend. Jesus Christ ceases to be the revelation of the Father, and the distinctive truth the gospel exists to declare is obscured. The gospel is modified.

Or men shrink from the claim of the gospel that Jesus is the world's only Saviour. How dogmatic, exclusive, presumptuous! Consider our Lord with the other great religious leaders of the world and men will discuss Him. Place Him in the group beside the Buddha, Confucius, Muhammad and Gandhi and we can assess His importance, perhaps even agree that He stands clearly above His peers. But single Jesus out, lift Him up, give Him a name that is above every name, place Him in an order of being that is eternal, say 'There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved,' and men will shake their heads and move away. 'Wait,' we cry, 'it is not quite so categorical as that.' Then begins the inevitable

process of emasculating the gospel, leaving us with a Christ shorn of His glory and stripped of His Divine prerogatives. We modify the gospel.

Against all such temptations to make acceptable our gospel we must set our faces. We dare not make it conform to the pattern of popular fashions in conduct and belief. 'There is no substitute, or near-substitute, for it,' says H. H. Farmer, 'nor can it be merged in anything else in a sort of amalgam . . . there is in the Christian message that which inevitably puts it in sharp opposition to, and protest against, much that, consciously or unconsciously, rules men's minds in our time.' Our gospel is clear, distinctive, and incomparable. It declares that man is in a predicament out of which, whatever his culture, and whatever his resources in knowledge and equipment, he cannot extricate himself. God only can rescue him and that God has done in Jesus Christ, the Crucified. That was the truth Paul openly declared. So must we.

Let us be quite clear on another point, Paul seems to say. When we are declaring our gospel we are not so much appealing to men's intellect as we are to their conscience. There is a place for the logical defence of the gospel but when we are seeking to win men, our business is not so much to prove the rightness of the faith as to proclaim it. 'Our object,' as Denney put it, 'is not to frame an irrefragable argument but to produce an irresistible impression.' The moral nature of man is the citadel against which we make our concentrated assault, not merely his reason. At the conscience where man is aware of his mortal struggle, of his persistent defeat, of his acute estrangement from man and God, we make our strong thrusts. 'This is my strategy,' says Paul; 'I commend the gospel to every man's conscience.'

It is easy for us in this age when we are bemoaning the feebleness of people's grasp of authentic Christianity to over-emphasize intellectual apprehension of the faith. 'They do not know the religion they say they believe.' That is our lament and it is abundantly justified. But let us not imagine that our ends would be achieved by drilling people into a word perfect recital of the Creed. The faith must come alive in human experience. It ought to be of the very substance of the life of man and the point at which it springs into life is the conscience. The faith becomes convincing and compelling when men experience its reality in resolving their conflicts and reconciling their estrangements. That happens in the conscience.

Thus, we are told, men felt the impact of a spiritual force when, on one occasion, they listened to Abraham Lincoln. He had been rebuked and reviled because of a magnanimous action towards the South in the Civil War. 'Your business is to destroy them, not to forgive them,' he was bitterly told. 'What, madam ?,' he replied, 'do I not destroy them when I make them my friends ?' The truth commended itself as it was exhibited in word and life and won an involuntary response from the conscience of men. Or here is a minister who is asked to visit a dying boy in a hospital ten miles away. It is late at night and transport is impossible. Surmounting almost insuperable obstacles the minister sees the boy and prays with him. The boy dies but his parents have been misinformed about the minister. They think he did not answer their request and never saw the boy, so they invite some one else to officiate at the funeral. To every one's confusion the minister attends the funeral, takes in at a glance the situation and, when spoken to, simply says, 'I am only here as a mourner.' A man who had never been to church was at that funeral and when he heard the whole truth, he exclaimed, 'If that's what Christianity is, it's time I was in on it.' He is one of our most faithful elders to-day. Such manifestations of the truth produce an irresistible impression—an impression that breaks down all the defences and grips and wins the soul. To that kind of declaration of the truth we are committed. We present Jesus Christ to our fellow-men so that He stabs their conscience awake and gains their eternal allegiance.

This was the ministry Paul exercised. He had no need of any testimonial from men to commend him. He had been accused of being a trickster, of practising all manner of artifices with the object of serving his own ends. 'I will allow the results of my work to speak for me,' he seems to say. 'I have so presented the Lord Jesus Christ that He has appealed to men's consciences and they have been changed. I will let that fact be my commendation.'

It could not have been otherwise, Paul proceeds, for he has fulfilled this ministry always as in the sight of God. His work had been done not with a man-regarding eye but ever in the knowledge that he stood in the presence of Almighty God. He sought neither praise nor blame from men but only the approval of God. Inevitably, therefore, he was free from the motives of which he was accused. It is man's only protection. Let him think of himself, of how his words or deeds are impressing others, of how clever and discerning he is in the presenting of Jesus Christ to men and his gospel is distorted. The centre of his message is shifted from his Master to himself and he fails. But no human assize has jurisdiction over the man who, like Paul, stands ever before the judgment bar of God.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

'Mid Change, Unchanged.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, D.D., LONDON.

'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.'—He 13^{8}.

If the author of the Hebrews could have come to a modern city, found his way to a church on a Sunday, he would have known then that his great claim for his Lord was justified. Not only the main facts of the Christian faith would be reaffirmed but he would be in fellowship with those whose lives had been fashioned, minds moulded by the same Christ whom he acknowledged as his Lord and Master. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' Making allowance for all human imperfection, he would realize in Christian worship to-day the presence of the same Christ he knew in his own day and generation.

This unchanged identity shows itself in the hymns of our faith. The great hymns about the Saviour—and there are many—represent the fruit of personal experience through the ages. But we can sing several of these in one service and be unaware of the fact that they were written centuries apart in time. For us they are hymns about the same person. Bernard of Clairvaux's 'Jesus Thou joy of loving hearts,' Charles Wesley's 'Love Divine,' John Keble's 'Sun of my soul,' Frances Ridley Havergal's 'I am trusting Thee, Lord Jesus,' they are all hymns about Jesus Christ who through the centuries came to them in spiritual experience the same unchanged reality. Along this line of proof, most significant is the evidence of Whittier of a different age, outlook, and country, yet his 'Immortal Love' with the verse

> But warm, sweet, tender, even yet
> A present help is He;
> And faith has still its Olivet,
> And love its Galilee.

is a true picture in modern life of the Christ of the gospel story.

Our own testimony is valid evidence. We learned in childhood 'the stories of Jesus we loved to hear.' Testing Him in the experiences of life, when so many values change, He remains to us essentially the same. One proof of that is the Lord's Prayer. It is our earliest memory and the centre of our devotional life through the years. He gives the Prayer meaning, vitality, power. Test Him by that Prayer, day by day and year by year, He is the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

Yesterday and to-day, what a gulf separates these two eras! Outside the Christian Church the author of the Epistle would find himself to-day in a vastly changed world. He would discover some things that had not changed but these would be in a museum, of archæological interest only. And therein lies the danger of stressing without explanation the unchanging nature of our faith. This is an age which expects something new almost every day. There is no need to enlarge on this, the evidence is around us. The expectation that a new and perhaps transforming discovery is just round the corner dominates all our thinking. What chance has a religious message got that speaks in terms of yesterday, of some one or something that does not change? The world is asking for a new cure for cancer, a harnessing of atomic power to the world of industry, a new intensive form of agriculture to meet the need of an increased population. The underlying thought is that scientific discovery and a new theory of economics will go far in solving the urgent problems of the day. This is the kind of Advent message that would be 'news.' Many have a respect, even an affection, for the Christian faith, it is indeed a lovely story, but viewed realistically they would say it has little relevance to the situation which faces them to-day, and no message for to-morrow.

The danger therefore is that the very claim of the Christian faith may be used as a convincing argument against it. Two answers can be given in reply to this attack on our position to-day. The first is that essentially the problems facing the world do not change. Given a scientific discovery it can still be used for good or evil. Any new theory of economics can be broken on the rock of human selfishness. Christ with the unchanged message of His life, death, and resurrection seeks to redeem mankind, mankind which is still essentially the same as it was in the days of His flesh. Of Him it has been well said 'His virtues are independent of temporary circumstances—really they are timeless. Freedom from care, humility, trust, singleness of heart and aim, the diligent use of gifts, self-forgetfulness, generosity, neighbourly kindness, and, above all, a loving concern for the helpless and self-destroyed together with an unquenchable aspiration after a moral perfection which shall reproduce the Father's own—what are these but just the forms of goodness which human life in this world calls for to-day?' These words seek to convey the spirit in which Jesus Christ lived and died. The Resurrection confirmed once and for all the eternal nature of this testimony to the Truth. If we have not His Spirit we are none of His, and our message of Him to the world must be unchanged to-day and to-morrow.

Can there be then no accommodation to the Spirit of the age, no account taken of the craving

to-day for a *new* way of life? The second answer deals with this aspect of the problem and seeks a solution in the personality of Christ Himself. We claim He is the same thus implying stability in our faith, but this does not mean stagnation. For when we say He is the same, what was He when He came into Galilee preaching and saying, 'Repent: for the kingdom of God is at hand?' Here was something new indeed, a veritable transforming of man and society! As a test of discipleship He bade Peter launch out into the deep and let down the nets for a draught. He warned His generation not to put new wine into old bottles, in other words He knew His message to be so revolutionary as to need nothing less than a new order of society. His enemies feared Him because He broke with tradition and they hated Him for His 'Moses said, but I say unto you.' His followers were to be persecuted because they were trying to turn the world upside down. He is the same to-day. If by the mercy of God there should be a Second Advent, a definite coming of our Lord, a new sense of His presence in our midst then of one thing we may be sure. The whole subject is wrapped in mystery: how such an event could happen and in what form He would come, personally or in some event of history, concerning this there will always be a difference of view among us; but of one truth we may be sure, He will be the same and therefore He will summon us to a new adventure, to launch out into the deep. It will be a bold challenge to the Church and to the world to abandon many things in which we have put our trust, to seek a new way to righteousness, peace, and joy. He will match the spirit of the age, the great scientific discoveries which are making the earth veritably a new world, with His own spiritual discoveries. Set Him on high, on the throne of the universe and of our own hearts and hear Him say, 'Behold, I make all things new.' Even so, come, Lord Jesus.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Advent and Personal Religion.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

'The Master is come, and calleth for thee.'—Jn 11^{28}.

When anxiety and sorrow visit a happy home the arrival of a well-loved and trusted friend always brings a wonderful strength and comfort. We can therefore enter into the feelings of Martha and Mary, the two bereaved sisters, when they realized that at long last the Master had arrived. Lazarus had died and was apparently beyond recall but the sisters were wonderfully sustained and uplifted by the bare thought that Jesus had come on the scene. Martha told her sister: 'The Master is come, and is asking for you.' Is there not music and poetry in the very sound of the words? For very many they have taken on a meaning that is intimate and deeply assuring. To-day they have transcended their original historic setting and bear for us a significance which brings us, too, light and consolation and good cheer.

Jesus was no stranger to the friends at Bethany. He was not 'called in' as a desperate last resort. He was their friend. He had been in their home many times before. Jesus loved Mary and Martha and Lazarus—all three. That was why His coming that day meant so much to them and brought them such ineffable comfort and hope. Let us look at these words as applying in various ways to our own lives. The Master still comes and calls to each one of us.

In the first place the Master still comes and enters into men's lives *as the dominating power*. We have many influences bearing upon us which make us the men and women we are. But as we try to valuate these and assess their power over us, there is but one towering name and one supreme and unchallengeable influence compared with whom all others pale into insignificance. Men and women have recognized this and have gladly and unreservedly surrendered all that they have and are in order that they might serve Him and be His for ever. The Master has come and called for them and they never falter in their practical acknowledgment of this Divine and all-enthralling domination. George Matheson expressed this in a hymn which is full of the paradoxes of Christian experience.

> My heart is weak and poor
> Until it master find.

In one of her novels Mary Webb sums it all up very concisely and movingly; she describes how the heroine felt when a young man knocked at the door of her heart and she realized that he was the 'master light of all her seeing.' The master had come into her heart's young life. 'The words made such a murmuration and were so piercing sweet that I wrote them in my book—"The Maister be come."'

It is not otherwise when Christ gets a chance with the soul. He has come whose right it is to reign. He comes to His own in our lives. As St. John puts it—'his love is perfected in us.' It was said of George Herbert that he used to whet his zeal in the service of God's altar by remembering in his ordinary conversation to add 'My

Master' when he made mention of the Blessed Name of our Lord. This may not appeal to the temperament of the present day. But Herbert, at all events, reminded himself of his obligations by using the words 'My Master,' and in one of his poems he refers to this habit thus :

How sweetly doth *My Master* sound ! *My Master.*
As ambergris leaves a rich scent
Unto the taster :
So do these words a sweet content,
An Oriental fragrancy, *My Master.*

In the second place, the Master still comes and *calls us to His service.* And when He speaks, He speaks in a voice which is like no other voice. It is the imperious voice of love and inspires us to do the thing which He commands. It is the sense of a personal call and of the love at the heart of it that constrains, one might say compels, us to obey His behest. There was Sister Dora, for example, who was often tired out and in need of rest as she served the needs of the dock labourers and their families. Even after her toilsome day was over, she was frequently called upon to serve the sick and comfort the sorrowful. To help her when she was thoroughly exhausted, she had written below the bell which summoned her to go out on her errand of mercy these words—'The Master is come and calleth for thee.' When she read the words she felt strengthened to go out with a cheerful heart. She put on record how it helped her from time to time to realize that in serving her poor sisters and brothers she was really and truly answering the call of the Master.

Not every one has had such a vision as was vouchsafed to Dr. Arthur J. Gossip in the midst of a busy pastorate. Yet, if we were even faintly to enter into his experience, it might shame us into a greater zeal and self-forgetfulness. In his Warrack Lectures he tells how he found himself, after many visits, dog-tired at the foot of a steep Glasgow stair and saying, 'I will go to-morrow,' when 'some one passed me and went up. . . . Just tired nerves, as you say, but I knew who it was and I heard Him say, "Well, if you won't go, then I must go myself" ; saw indeed only a dim greyness of mounting shoulders, dreadfully tired shoulders. But I knew who it was, flushed to my soul and ran after Him, and Christ and I went in together.' The Master called. He had to go. Christ makes His relationship to us quite clear. 'If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet ; ye also ought to wash one another's feet.' 'Ye call me Master and Lord . . . for so I am.' We can only answer with the slave of old, 'I love my master . . . I will not go out free.'

Then, finally, the Master comes to his friends and *calls for them in the visitation of death.*

We walk by faith as strangers here.
But Christ shall call us home.

Bunyan in his own inimitable way has illustrated this in his description of Christiana's home call. 'So the post [from the Celestial City] presented her with a letter. . . . When he had read this letter to her, he gave her therewith a sure token that he was a true messenger, and was come to bid her make haste to be gone . . . she called for Mr. Great-heart her guide, and told him how matters were. So he told her he was heartily glad of the news, and could have been glad had the post come for him. . . . The last words that she was heard to say were, I come, Lord, to be with thee, and bless thee.' Bunyan expresses this in more direct and intimate fashion in these impressive words : 'If death did come alone to us, it would be terrible to us indeed ; but here is the comfort that Christ our dearest Lord will come with death to sweeten it for us, and support us under it.'

George Macdonald wrote in *The Diary of an Old Soul* :

I was like Peter when he began to sink.
To Thee a new prayer therefore I have got—
That, when Death comes in earnest to my door,
Thou wouldst Thyself go, when the latch doth clink,
And lead him to my room, up to my cot ;
Then hold Thy child's hand, hold and leave him not,
Till Death has done with him for evermore.

This is the authentically Christian view of death—a home-call. It is He who holds the door ; that door of which we may say, 'He openeth, and no man shutteth ; and shutteth, and no man openeth.' He who has been with us from our beginning will be with us 'at our end and at our departing.'

Advent proclaims to us that Christ, the Son of God has come. He comes to visit us in great humility and He shall come again in His glorious majesty to judge both the quick and the dead, as the Prayer Book tells us. Let us not forget that He also knocks at the door of each heart, and comes down His own secret stair to speak to us about our own personal obligations.

Who calleth ? Thy Master calleth.
Sit, disciple, and learn of Him.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Way of Joy.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, B.D., GLASGOW.

'Your joy no man taketh from you.'—Jn 16^{22}.

There was in the thought of the ancient world a strange undercurrent of melancholy and of pessimism. We think of the Greeks as a joyous, sunny-hearted people; and yet Homer can make Zeus say, 'There is nothing, methinks, more piteous than a man of all things that creep and breathe upon the earth.' And Theognis says with a kind of bleak despair, 'No mortal is happy of all on whom the sun looks down.' We think of the Romans as solid, rather unemotional, steady people; and yet Virgil's best-known lines are the haunting words about 'the tears of things and the mortal woes that touch men's hearts.'

Into this darkened world there came Christianity, and Christianity was specifically the religion of joy. In the New Testament the words 'rejoice' and 'joy' both occur more than fifty times. It was precisely one of the accusations levelled against Jesus by the orthodox people of His day that He was far too happy. He Himself described His little band as the children of the bride chamber. They lived like men who were the privileged guests at a wedding feast.

The great characteristic of Christian joy has always been and must always be that it is the joy of conquest. It is not the fleeting joy which comes of escaping things; it is the joy that comes of meeting things at their worst and conquering them. It is not the joy which might come momentarily and temporarily from the influence of some drug or some stimulant; it is the joy which comes of looking life in the face and of knowing that we are more than conquerors.

1. *The Christian joy is the joy of those who have overcome the world.* To the man of the ancient world, as it is to the savage of to-day, the world was a terrifying place. He believed that the air was thickly populated with spirits, most of them malignantly waiting to work men harm. Hesiod speaks of 'diseases silent and voiceless which hover around mortals and assail them. Never by day shall they cease from toil or sorrow, or in the night-time from destruction.' The world was a hostile world. Things are not so very different nowadays although we would not put it in just the same way. There are times when we feel that there is a natural perversity in things, that circumstances are up against us, that we are in the grip of blind forces making for destruction. It is possible in such an age as that in which we live to look at the world and to feel that, do what we may and strive as we will, we are caught up in forces which are too strong for us. The Christian conviction is that this is God's world. It has been said that in the old days, when there were great tracts of the world still unknown and still unexplored, men drew their maps and on the blank, unknown spaces they wrote, 'Here be burning fiery sands,' or, 'Here be devils.' But the Christian, across every inch of his map, can write, 'Here is God.' As Whittier wrote:

> I know not where His islands lift
> Their fronded palms in air;
> I only know I cannot drift
> Beyond His love and care.

There is a deep, abiding joy in the sense that we are God's children and that nothing can separate us from the love of God, for the companionship of God is the end of fear.

2. *The Christian joy is the joy of those who have overcome their circumstances.* The inadequacy of human joy consists in its insecurity. 'Joy,' some one has said, 'is like the ague; one good day between two bad ones.' But the Christian joy is quite independent of circumstances. Dr. Maltby in one of his books once said: 'Jesus promised His disciples three things; that they would be entirely fearless, absurdly happy and in constant trouble.' The fact that they were in constant trouble in no way interfered with the joy of the Christians. When Paul and Silas were in the stocks in the prison at Philippi they sang praises to God. When Pionius and his comrades were flung into the darkest corner of the prison in Smyrna they sang without ceasing, 'Glory to Thee, O God.'

And that can still happen. There was a girl who fell ill with an inexplicable illness. The illness brought increasing paralysis and increasing helplessness, until she who had loved the open air, and the open road and the sunlight had to lie in utter immobility awaiting death. A friend used to visit her regularly. One day the friend brought her a little gift. It was a book of cheer and comfort, written with an extraordinarily vivid, radiant spirit of sheer happiness, a book of joy. The bed-ridden girl took the book. 'I know this book,' she said. 'Have you read it already?' asked her friend. 'Yes,' said the helpless girl, 'I've read it already; you see, *I wrote it.*' Here was this girl in utter helplessness, dealt what any one might think a knock-out blow by life, and from her bed she sent to others this message of joy.

The Christian has the utter conviction that God is standing within the shadows keeping watch upon His own; that God is love. And therefore the Christian is able to accept that which he cannot understand and to cling unshakably to the

certainty that all things do work together for good to them that love God.

3. *The Christian joy is the joy of those who have overcome death.* The ancient world was haunted by the fear of death. A poet like Theognis wrote with grim and almost cynical resignation, 'I rejoice and disport me in my youth. Long enough beneath the earth shall I lie, bereft of life, voiceless as a stone, and shall leave the loved sunlight. Good man as I am, then shall I see nothing any more.' Even a prophet so great as Isaiah (38^{18}) cries out hopelessly: 'The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.' In death there was the dreadful finality of the end. What a contrast to the martyrs who went singing to the Cross and the stake and the arena, 'We have lived; we shall live; hallelujah.'

The Christian has what no one else has. He has a Lord and Master who conquered the last enemy, even death; and who has promised to His own that they will share in that victory. There was an old saint who was a very great man but a very humble man. Always when he went on to a platform to speak, or when he entered a room, he would stand back and say to the person in front of him, 'You first: I'll follow.' When he was dying and very near the end they saw his lips move in speech and they bent down to catch his whispered words. He was saying again what he had said so often, 'You first: I'll follow,' and who can doubt that this time he was speaking to his Lord as his soul sought entry at the gateway of eternity?

Your joy, said Jesus, no man taketh from you. Into a gloomy and a pessimistic world, with an aching melancholy at the heart of it, even when it seemed most glad, He brought a joy that none else could give and that no one could ever take away. It is different from all earthly joys because it is the joy of conquest. The fear of the world is conquered because it is God's world and in every corner of it there is the presence of the God who is love. The chances and the changes of life are conquered, for behind them all is God in perfect wisdom, love and power working for the best. The fear of death is conquered for He who is our Master is the Lord of death and His victory is our victory. Wherefore lift up your hearts for your joy no man taketh from you.

Natural Law and Dogma.

A Critical Review of some Issues raised in 'Can Two Walk Together,' by Professor Ian Henderson.

By the Reverend W. Lillie, D.D., Dulnain Bridge, Grantown-on-Spey.

Professor Ian Henderson, in the second chapter of his book, *Can Two Walk Together?*, sets himself the task 'to try and ascertain if there is a stock of moral truths ascertainable by and acceptable to men of different dogmatic convictions.' He points out that 'Roman Catholic writers maintain that the term "Natural Law" describes a body of moral principles apprehensible alike by men of all or no dogmatic convictions.' He goes on to state four assumptions which the theory of Natural Law, 'so admirably stated by Father Rickaby,' seems to make, and which Professor Henderson holds to be untenable. We have already here the confusion which spoils Professor Henderson's argument in this chapter and throughout the book, a confusion between Natural Law itself and a theory of Natural Law.

'The term "Natural Law" describes a body of moral principles.' Natural Law does not consist of statements of metaphysical or theological truth such as, 'The essential element in man is the spark of divine reason which he embodies.' Natural Law consists of statements like that given as an example by Father Rickaby, 'Benefactors ought to be requited' (in my opinion, another wording is preferable to this). All principles of Natural Law can be most adequately expressed in propositions with the following characteristics: (*a*) They have as subject a word denoting either 'All human beings' or 'All human beings of a certain class' (it is the universality of the principles of Natural Law that makes them analogous to other forms of 'law' such as the scientific laws of physics). (*b*) They have as predicate the verb 'ought to' followed by a verb in the active voice, or more strictly followed by 'set themselves to,' again followed by a verb in the active voice (it is with action or doing, certainly interpreted in the widest sense, that Natural Law is primarily concerned). According to this view Father Rickaby's example would be more adequately expressed in the form, 'All men who have

received benefits ought to set themselves to requite their benefactors.' It is obvious that the statement, ' The essential element in man is the spark of divine reason which he embodies,' is not a principle of this kind.

Unfortunately the term ' dogma ' is not defined in the book under review, and it is very difficult to know when a statement can be fairly called a dogma. In the first meaning given by the Shorter Oxford Dictionary, ' that which is held as an opinion ; a belief,' almost any intelligible statement may be a dogma. We hold as an opinion even something that we have just observed, such as, ' This book has fallen to the floor ' ; and, in this meaning, a principle of Natural Law is certainly a dogma. It is likely, however, that Professor Henderson is thinking of the second group of meanings given by the Dictionary, ' the body of opinion formulated and authoritatively stated ; tenets or principles collectively ; doctrinal system.' With this meaning, a statement presumably becomes a dogma when it implies the acceptance of a certain doctrinal system. Professor Henderson has manifestly a theological or metaphysical system of doctrine in mind, but a scientific system or even a common-sense system may be fairly included among dogmas. With this second meaning, the statement, ' This book has fallen to the ground,' is not a dogma ; nor, in my opinion, is the universal statement, ' All bodies heavier than air tend to fall to the ground when left unsupported.' Newton's formulation of the law of gravitation, ' Every portion of matter attracts or tends to approach every other portion of matter in the universe with a force proportional to the masses and inversely as the square of the distance,' is a dogma implying as it does a certain system of doctrines of physics.

To which of these statements of physics is a statement of Natural Law, such as, ' All men who have received benefits ought to set themselves to requite their benefactors,' analogous ? From Professor Henderson's discussion he would seem to hold that it is analogous to the law of gravitation, implying in some way a set of dogmas about reason being the essential element in man, equalitarianism and the unity of mankind in a single society. But surely the essential characteristic of a doctrine of Natural Law is that it is a body of moral principles apprehensible by both those who hold and those who do not hold this or any other set of dogmas. If there is no such body of moral principles then the whole conception of Natural Law is false, and we need not bother ourselves about its theoretical implications. It appears to me that a principle of Natural Law is analogous to the physical statement, ' All bodies heavier than air tend to fall to the ground when left unsupported.' Just as we see directly this book falling to the ground, so we sometimes see directly the rightness of a particular action ; and just as we see by what Professor Broad has called ' intuitive induction ' the universal rule, ' All bodies heavier than air tend to fall to the ground when left unsupported,' so we know intuitively the universal principles of Natural Law. I am almost, but not entirely, satisfied with this analogy, because I think that men know the moral principle more directly than they know the universal principle in a physical observation. We need not expect our ordinary formulation of principles of Natural Law to be any more accurate than those of the common-sense observer in the world of physics ; than, for example, ' The sun always moves round the earth from East to West.' It is the task of moralists to attain to more accurate and consistent formulations of moral principles, just as it is the task of scientists to attain to more accurate and consistent formulations of the generalizations derived from the observations of our senses.

Professor Henderson rightly regards as untenable the orthodox Romanist assumption that the first principles of morality are self-evident, but he does not examine the evidence that we do have for the principles of Natural Law. As far as I understand the subtleties of the Logical Positivists, they have shown conclusively that the only propositions which are logically self-evident are tautologies (a view in which they show a surprising measure of agreement with Father Rickaby's first assumption) ; such tautologies include, according to the Logical Positivists, the purely formal statements of mathematics and logic, which say nothing about the nature of things. In as far as these formal statements depend on the acceptance of axioms or postulates, they are self-evident only on the basis of such axioms or postulates. I can find no good grounds for thinking that the principles of Natural Law are tautologies. There is, however, a secondary kind of logical self-evidence. If we have a deductive system based on certain postulates, or dogmas (as Professor Henderson might call them), then a proposition may be self-evident in the sense, that if we are given the dogmas, the propositions must logically follow. A natural science is (ideally, at any rate) a deductive system, from which there can be deduced statements that correspond to facts observed by our senses. Moral Philosophy or Ethics represents the attempt of moralists to construct a deductive system, from which can be deduced those principles of Natural Law ascertainable by and acceptable to men of different dogmatic convictions. This is the only kind of self-evidence that we can ever hope to attain for such principles. If St. Thomas Aquinas were alive to-day I imagine that this would be

the kind of self-evidence he would claim for principles of Natural Law, with the addition (which I cannot accept) that the basic dogmas of his deductive system of morals are axioms. Yet the evidence that a modern upholder of Natural Law would claim for its principles is not logical self-evidence at all; it is rather the kind of evidence that we claim for empirical statements. These principles, we hold, will be accepted by the unprejudiced observer, who understands their meaning. Now it is the case in physical science that a statement like the Law of Gravitation is not as readily accepted to be true as a statement like 'This book has fallen to the floor,' and to the scientifically ignorant Newton's Law is more easily apprehended as true than the mysterious formulations of Relativity physics. This warns us that in ethics the ordinary man's intuitions of Natural Law may be a long way from the objective truth of the matter, although they point more or less in that direction. The truth of a principle does not imply that it will be immediately evident to any observer. (I have never been able to regard as obviously true the third law of motion that action and reaction are always equal and opposite; the example that the teacher gave me of the kick of a rifle did not help me, for it was clear to me in my ignorance that the amount of kick depended on the way I held the rifle rather than on the action of the exploding cartridge. Yet the third law, subject to limits of expression, is a valid natural law in physics.) To summarize, our moral principles, which are not tautologies, are known to us very much in the way that the simplest universal statements of physics are known, directly if not very accurately. The plain man's moral principles can be formulated more and more accurately, but often in more obscure terms, by the moral philosophers, but they depend on the plain man's intuitions very much in the same way as the laws of physics depend on our observations of books and apples falling to the ground. It may require genius and even Divine inspiration in both cases to know the objective truth.

It is with regard to the fourth and, in my opinion, vital assumption that I must cross swords with Professor Henderson. 'In asserting that Natural Law provides men of different dogmatic convictions with a common basis of knowledge about moral matters, the theory entirely ignores the possibility that Natural Law may itself be a dogma, accepted by some men and rejected by others.' Professor Henderson has little difficulty in showing that certain dogmas about equality and the place of reason in human nature, which have formed part of the theoretical justification of Natural Law, have been accepted by some men (notably the British and Americans to-day) and rejected by others (notably the Germans). It is clear, however, that people may accept the principles of Natural Law without holding what Professor Henderson calls 'the three subordinate forms taken by the fundamental Stoic dogma,' or, for that matter, without holding any dogmatic convictions at all. It may be the case, although I should require more evidence to believe it, that 'the immanent dogmas of Stoicism and Christianity do almost exactly coincide,' but it is impossible to believe that there can be a separation of the immanent and the transcendent dogmas of Christianity, and that his transcendent dogmas did not in some measure determine St. Thomas Aquinas's treatment of Natural Law (for example in the relation of Natural Law to the Will of God). And it is very clear from the accounts given in Gierke's *Natural Law and the Theory of Society* that the seventeenth and eighteenth century exponents of Natural Law had a very different set of dogmas from the orthodox Romanist dogmas. (St. Thomas Aquinas had a very different idea of equality from that of the eighteenth century.)

It is also the case that the formulations of the principles of Natural Law vary from time to time and are influenced by the dogmas of those who put them into words. Father Rickaby's and my own formulations of the 'gratitude for benefits' principle may savour of the Feudal System to a generation that has learned to regard the State as a universal provider, but that still regards gratitude or something very like it as right. Yet it is no more a dogma to hold that all benefactors ought to be requited than to hold that all bodies heavier than air tend to fall to the ground. A disciple of Einstein would certainly express the latter proposition in different language, and an ardent Marxist would alter the language of the former, both to suit their dogmas, but they are for the ordinary man apparently true statements.

Professor Henderson's really important contention is that he is not at all sure that the *primâ facie* duties of Dr. Ross would appear self-evident to a Hindu or a Japanese; and he goes on to remark that the Japanese do not have a variant version of Euclid. If Professor Henderson could convince us that the principles of Natural Law, such as 'Benefactors ought to be requited,' are not ascertainable by and acceptable to Hindus and Japanese, then Natural Law may be a dogma accepted by some men and rejected by others. This is a question that can only be decided by observation, and I can only set my experience against Professor Henderson's. In a twenty years' experience of teaching ethics to Hindu and Muhammadan students, I certainly found that they did not state some of their *primâ facie* duties in the way that Dr. Ross or Professor Henderson

would, and that there were considerable differences in the detailed obligations recognized ; but, on the whole, I could assume that the contents of Natural Law were as acceptable to Hindus and Muhammadans in India as they were to a West European like myself. To put it more concretely, there was a general assent to the five Commandments of the Decalogue (the fifth to the ninth) which deal with our outward duties to our fellow-men ; what was more surprising was an acceptance of the validity of the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount in spite of a general opinion that they were impracticable. I admit, of course, that it is easy for a teacher to be misled by his students as to what they really think. My experience of the principles of Natural Law in India was not unlike what Professor Henderson's would be if he were faced by a Japanese version of Euclid. The units of measurement would be different, the concrete examples used would be different, but ultimately the Professor would find the same familiar patterns and the same fundamental truths as he had known in a British text-book. It seems a very sweeping judgment, although I have not the experience to contradict it, that ' young Nazis shared no body of moral judgments with Christians.' From what I have read about Germany just before the War, I should have thought that the moral judgments of the young Nazis were certainly perverted by ' complexes ' (in the widest use of that much abused term) and, as Professor Henderson indicates, by at least one false dogma ; but that with patient and sympathetic insight one could have seen behind all their brutalities a dim recognition of Natural Law. In my experience, those who deliberately set themselves to reject moral principles regard their rejection as a temporary necessity ; there is always to be fair dealing and common kindness to-morrow, but to-morrow never comes. Even after the somewhat shattering experiences of war, this statement by Mr. C. S. Lewis still holds true in my opinion : ' Think of a country where people were *admired* for running away in battle, or where a man felt *proud* of double-crossing all the people who had been kindest to him. You might just as well try to imagine a country where two and two make five. Men have differed as regards what people you ought to be unselfish to—whether it was only your own family, or your fellow country-men or every one. But they have always agreed that you oughtn't to put yourself first. Selfishness has never been admired. Men have differed as to whether you should have one wife or four. But they have always agreed that you mustn't simply have any woman you liked.' [1] And even if there be cases where this is not true, this does not invalidate the principles of Natural Law ; the fact that some people are blind does not disprove the laws of the refraction of light.

[1] C. S. Lewis, *Broadcast Talks*, 11.

In order to get more close to the relations of principles of Natural Law to dogmas, we shall examine a statement on p. 3 of the book under review—' Our morals . . . can either be a criterion or a consequence of our dogmas. They cannot be both.' Professor Henderson has no difficulty in convincing us that our dogmas do sometimes have an influence on our moral judgments, although his example of the girl sent to seduce St. Thomas Aquinas from his vocation seems an unfortunate one. In spite of my being a Protestant rejecting the dogma of celibacy, I still hold that to resist the seductions of the appetites in obedience to a call of duty is in accordance with a principle of Natural Law. I wonder if the story would seem an equally funny one to Professor Henderson if a member of our Air Defence had been seduced by a woman from his post of duty during the War and a number of the Professor's friends had been killed as a result, although the loss of these friends could, humanly speaking, have hardly been as great a disaster as the loss of St. Thomas Aquinas to the Christian Church. Again, Professor Henderson is certainly right in holding that our moral judgments do influence our dogmas ; most people have rejected on moral grounds the dogma of hell in the form in which it was formerly held. The whole argument of the book indicates that our dogmas ought to influence our moral judgments, and its conclusion appears to be a re-emphasis on dogma as a foundation of moral principles. If I understand the book rightly, what Professor Henderson would deny is that our moral judgments ought to influence our dogmas ; they are (in his view) in some sense a consequence of our dogmas, so that they cannot be at the same time a criterion of our dogmas. There are dogmas that seem to come direct to a prophet from heaven, and the religious man accepts these dogmas, even although they are contradicted by experience (a state of affairs of which Professor Henderson gives examples). Yet it is a state of affairs which many thinkers cannot honestly accept as a permanent part of their thought or dogmatic system. We should need either to re-examine the experience or to abandon the dogma as the word of a false prophet. This is not, however, the only way in which dogmas come to the human mind. They come, as the human mind, directed in its best thinking by the Holy Spirit of God, reflects on experience—on apples and books and other bodies falling to the ground in the case of physics, on ' benefits forgot ' and ' man's ingratitude ' in the case of morals. The mind, by means of processes and inspirations which we are far from under-

standing completely, reacts by making statements in the form ' All A is B ' in the case of a scientific law, and in the form ' All A ought to be B ' in the case of a moral law. Laws of both these kinds form an important part of the material out of which our dogmas are made, and if we ignore the moral Law of Nature we are leaving out an important side of human experience and an important source of human knowledge; dogmas made without taking our moral intuitions into consideration will certainly be defective. If the time has come, as I think it has come, to attempt a new theoretical justification of Natural Law, one of the endeavours of moral philosophers will be to integrate the laws of science and the laws of morality into a single system. This may be a task beyond the capacity of the human mind, but we can at least see that there is room for influence in both directions. The moralist must take account of the facts known to science (this is the truth of Professor Henderson's plea for *Realpolitik*); and the dogmatist must take account of Natural Law. To some extent, in spite of Professor Henderson's denial, our morals are both criteria (or I should prefer to say ' data ') and consequences of our dogmas.

It is his neglect of Natural Law as an operative factor in human situations that leads Professor Henderson to the extraordinary emphasis on geopolitical factors in chapter six of his book. When he says that ' the dogmas of Natural Law have overthrown many tyrants, but there is one tyrant whom they cannot overthrow and that tyrant is Geography,' we are reminded of the cruder nineteenth century theories of the ' economic man ' whose conduct was entirely determined by economic factors. Fortunately such an ' economic man ' never actually existed. And the course of world history so lucidly expounded by the geopoliticians as entirely determined by geographical factors is an equally unreal abstraction. Has not our author heard of the faith that removes mountains? Even if we leave out, as far as we can, revealed religion and its dogmas (and of course we are making an unreal abstraction in doing so), we must still contend that one factor in every human situation is man's apprehension, however perverted or misguided, of what is right, and sometimes it is the dominant factor. It is indeed one of the principles of Natural Law that all men ought to set themselves to do what is right, however much other factors influence their conduct in a wrong direction. It is certainly the case that principles of Natural Law will find different applications in twentieth century conditions from their applications in first century conditions and there is constant need for moralists to ' inject a little *Realpolitik* into their thinking ' by facing how the principles of Natural Law apply in our actual situation. Yet, if there is indeed a Natural Law not ' one law for Rome and another for Athens, nor one at this date and another at a later one, but one law which shall embrace all races over all time eternal and immortal,' [1] then while there can be varying applications in varying circumstances, there can never be any substitution of one Natural Law by another. There is a vagueness in Professor Henderson's book which does suggest, as an overruling consideration, that, since ' the prestige of the dogma ' of Natural Law cannot ' survive the fall of the society that it has helped to build,' it is morally imperative to maintain that society in existence and so the prestige of the doctrine. Men of insight, however, have always seen one principle of Natural Law to be that ' justice should always be done though the heavens fall.' The consequences of obeying the principles of Natural Law are not relevant facts unless of course it be a principle dealing with consequences. If justice and mercy lead to the downfall of our Western civilization, then we can only let our civilization perish.

I shall conclude this somewhat critical review with two general observations. (*a*) The book seems to me an unfortunate one in so far as it may suggest to many readers that a leading Christian thinker in Scotland to-day holds that moral principles are principles that can be changed with each new fashion in dogma. I do not believe that Professor Henderson thinks this, but his failure to make a clear distinction between the actual principles of Natural Law and the dogmas of Natural Law philosophers leaves his book open to this misinterpretation. My own reading of the ' signs of the times ' is that there is a need of re-emphasis on the eternal and immutable nature of fundamental moral principles. (*b*) Yet, just because these principles have come to appear as relative or even subjective principles in our own day, there is a great need for a new theory of Natural Law, preserving what is true in Stoic and Catholic and eighteenth-century doctrine, and yet speaking in the language of our own age, and taking account of its extended knowledge. And, unless I have misunderstood this book entirely, I think that Professor Henderson and I are in this matter of one mind.

[1] Cicero, *Republic.*

Contributions and Comments.

Romans viii. 28.

WHAT is the subject of this sentence? Is it 'all things' as in the A.V., or 'God' as in the R.V. (margin)?

In the A.V. a statement is made which on its face value it is difficult to uphold in the face of actual events, where many things do not seem to be 'working together for good.' In the popular mind also it may give grounds for the prevalent superstition that 'it will all come right in the end,' a point of view which is debilitating and may easily lead to disillusionment and cynicism. The expositor therefore is driven to put the emphasis upon the latter part of the sentence by suggesting that this experience is limited to 'those that love God.' But here again the actual turn of events raises doubts, as the believer is not immune from 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.' A further explanation must therefore be made to the effect that the word 'good' must be interpreted in a deeper sense than 'that which is pleasant at the moment.' While this is true, is it what the Apostle is actually saying here?

The manuscript evidence may be summarized by Sanday and Headlam. 'A small but important group of authorities, A B Orig. 2/6 or 2/7 (cf. Boh. Sah. Aeth.), adds ὁ Θεός; and the insertion lay so much less near at hand than the omission that it must be allowed to have the greater appearance of originality. With this reading συνεργεῖ must be taken transitively, "causes all things to work."' This reveals a strong tradition that whether ὁ Θεός is actually present in the text or not συνεργεῖ is to be treated as transitive with πάντα as object. This view is supported by C. H. Dodd in his Moffatt *Commentary*, who says 'whichever reading be adopted, the familiar translation is not an admissible rendering of the Greek. . . . The literal translation is: "With those who love God, He co-operates in all respects for good."' And again 'It would not occur to Paul to look to "things" to "work together" for the salvation of man. What he does look for, and find, is God's co-operation with us *in* things, even things which are hostile to us.'

Three further facts may be noted.

(1) There is a parallel passage in 1 Co 12[6] where similar words are used and συνεργεῖ is transitive and πάντα is the object.

(2) In no other case does Paul use πάντα as the subject of a sentence.

(3) Later in the chapter the phrase 'all these things' is used to denote adverse circumstances.

It can therefore be established that the statement that Paul was making was not that 'all things work together for good' but rather that Some One is at work for the benefit of those who love God and that nothing is outside the scope of His activity.

The next question to be asked is, 'who is that Some One?' Evidently some copyists suggested ὁ Θεός and with good reason in view of 1 Co 12[6]. What I would humbly suggest is that it is the Holy Spirit that the Apostle had in mind as the subject of the sentence. In support of this view I would submit:

(1) The Holy Spirit is the 'hero' of this chapter. In these few *vv.*[26-28] He is mentioned as the active agent to help the believer in his need. Thus 'the Spirit helpeth our infirmities' and 'the Spirit maketh intercession for us,' and so he continues 'the Spirit worketh all things together for good.'

(2) In 1 Co 12[11] the Holy Spirit is the subject. This also is a chapter that is steeped in the thought of the Holy Spirit.

(3) This statement 'the Holy Spirit worketh all things together for good to them that love God' is true to Christian experience and is a virile and encouraging thought.

A recent personal experience has illustrated this interpretation. The relationship between three people had become seriously entangled, in a way that was likely to lead to a frustration of God's purpose for one of them at least, and an open breach between sincere Christians. All three parties were praying about it, and to one of them, as he prayed, the thought came that a certain minister should be called into consultation. After several interviews an entirely new suggestion was made which was acceptable to all parties, and which brought them together into a closer fellowship. It was acknowledged by all to be the work of the Holy Spirit. Each person concerned, while anxious for a solution, was only able to see a part of the situation, and therefore only a part of the possible solution. The Holy Spirit 'worked these together for good' and His activity was recognized not only in the satisfactory result but also in the deeper fellowship created.

ERIC H. DANIELL.

Birmingham.

Tumbleweed.

IN re-reading a boyhood favourite, William Thomson's *The Land and The Book*, I was struck by his suggestion for the translation of 'galgal'

in Ps 83^{13} and Is 17^{13} as tumbleweed. His description of these weeds driven hither and thither as the wind blows recalls to me exactly such scenes as I have observed them in the great fields of the Middle West of America, millions of tumbleweeds rolling, racing, bounding in one mad rush to escape the furious wind. Their movement is only stopped by the dying down of the wind, by a fence or hedgerow or by ravines, in any of which places they pile up in great drifts.

It seems surprising how commentators and translators have been content to give some stereotyped rendering without the slightest indication that there is something wrong in the comparisons presented. Briggs in the *International Critical Commentary*, Barnes in the *Westminster Commentary*, Lattey in the *Westminster Series*, McFadyen, and numerous others seem oblivious to the idea of anything being incongruous. But Gunkel in his *Commentary on the Psalms* gives the idea advanced by Thomson with reasons. W. O. E. Oesterley in his *Notes on the Hebrew Psalms* quotes Gunkel and in his large Commentary adds in his notes a quotation from Thomson as well, with approval. Why he should translate 'thistle-down' which seems so weak and unwarranted is hard to understand. Perhaps he has never seen tumbleweeds driven before the wind and so fails to appreciate the vigour of the illustration. Of all the commentaries and translations that I have in English only the American Translation seems to me to give the correct rendering.

The A.V. Ps 83^{11-13} has, 'Make . . . all their princes as Zebah and as Zalmunna: who said let us take to ourselves the houses of God in possession. O my God make them like a wheel; as the stubble before the wind.'

Without knowing anything of the original language one might be pardoned for wondering what is the point in making a comparison between the taking possession of houses and wheels or what likeness there is between wheels and stubble. What is opprobrious in a wheel? It is a very useful thing. How would the princes be hurt if they were not injured more than stubble is by wind? When the wind is over stubble remains in the same place apparently as good as before.

The R.V. doesn't help much, merely changing 'wheel' to 'whirling dust' which presumably refers to a tornado or dust-spout which is in shape and action the same as a waterspout. This makes no attempt to take possession of anything, and one watching it would not think of fleeing hosts.

Mr. Thomson seems to have been the first to suggest a translation that makes sense without doing violence to the original Hebrew. His idea is given in the American Translation, 'Make . . . their princes like Zebah and Zalmunna who said, We will seize for ourselves the meadows of God. My God make them like the tumbleweed, Like chaff before the wind.'

Here the comparisons are vivid. They are true to botanical lore. There is no violent change in the meaning of the Hebrew word. The tumbleweed is truly a 'rolling thing,' so that the addition of it to the meanings given in Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew Lexicon or its substitution, for 'whirling dust' would seem to be a good thing.

This translation fits in admirably with the picture of the coming of the Midianite sheikhs Zebah and Zalmunna with their hosts 'as grasshoppers for multitude' destroying everything in their path. These sheikhs did not come up to take possession of 'houses' (A.V.) or 'habitations' (R.V.). They came bringing their own dwelling-places, 'tents.' They came to take possession of the produce of the fields, and they did this so thoroughly that not only no grain but not even a domestic animal was left to the Israelites. They had covered the fields as the growing tumbleweeds take full possession. And then came the day of reckoning when they fled before Gideon and the gathering clans of Israel as tumbleweeds before a tempestuous wind. And when the pursuit was over not one remained. The fields were completely clear of them (Jos 6–8).

There remains one criticism of the American Translation, namely, the word 'meadow.' It was for fields of ripening grain that the Midianites came up. Tumbleweeds do not flourish in meadows but they take possession of stubble fields after the harvest is over. Then they cover the place. For this reason, Moffatt's rendering 'fields' seems preferable, and with the change we have completely harmonious pictures.

The American Translation of Is 17^{13} would be improved by changing 'whirling dust' to 'a tumbleweed.'

W. R. Hutton.

Nowgong, Assam.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Vulgate Text of Chronicles. While the Jesuits of the Pontifical Institute pursue their task of producing a new Latin Version of the Bible, of which the Psalter and Canticles have so far been issued, the Benedictines are continuing the task entrusted to them by the Pope in 1907. That was the critical establishment of the text of the Vulgate. The revisions of the text that were

made in the post-Reformation period yielded a text which became the *textus receptus*, but which could not claim to be the original text of the Version, and to the Benedictines was therefore assigned the task of recovering as far as possible the original text. In addition, a full critical apparatus is provided, making the new edition of the greatest importance to all Biblical scholars. So far seven volumes have been published, of which the first appeared in 1926 and the seventh in 1948, containing the two books of Chronicles.[1] The patient and exacting work of textual criticism gets little of the limelight enjoyed by some other branches of learning, but is of the greatest importance to every side of Biblical scholarship.

The Message of the Old Testament. In a short book, now in its second edition, the Dutch Professor P. A. H. de Boer unfolds the *Message of the Old Testament*.[2] After a brief introduction, in which the cultural and religious *milieu* of Israel is examined, and the salient dates of her history indicated, the writer proceeds to a study of Israel's origins, laws—including prophetic law, as illustrated by Is 1^{10-20}—the hymn of creation, ancient stories, priests and kings, prophets, psalms, and suffering—including the Book of Job and the Suffering Servant. The intention is thus to illustrate the types of material found in the Old Testament, and the purpose their preservation served. Under none of these headings is there anything like a full survey of all the passages that belong to it. At the head of each section there stands a reference to a single passage to be read before the section is read. This is in accordance with the author's observation that books about the Old Testament can never take the place of the reading of the Old Testament itself. While the author is a well-informed scholar, the book is written simply to be of use to ordinary readers, and is to be commended for its direction of the reader to the Bible itself. It compresses a surprising amount of material into its brief compass, and the reader who digests it will have acquired some clear ideas as to the meaning of this Book for to-day.

Holiness in the Prophets. The Swedish scholar, H. Ringgren, who holds a chair in the Finnish University of Åbo, and whose book, *Word and Wisdom*, has already been noted in these columns, has published a brief study on *The Prophetical Conception of Holiness*.[3] The author is doubtful of the commonly accepted view that the original meaning of the root קדש is 'to be separated,' though he does not think the alternative meaning 'to be pure' can be proved. Further, while he does not hold that Israelite religion was static, he is doubtful if any development of meaning can be established. He argues that holiness was conceived of as a quality of God before it was thought of as a quality of men and things, and that in relation to God it referred to his exaltedness and in relation to men and things it had a ritual meaning. In Is 7 he finds an ethical meaning, and also in Ezk 28^{18} and Zeph 3^4, but observes that the ethical import of holiness was not fully developed in the Old Testament. Drawing attention to the generally recognized fact that the phrase 'Holy One of Israel' is characteristic of the whole book of Isaiah, he makes the intriguing remark that this may be of a certain significance for the question of the unity of the book. Surely it is not suggested that Isaiah is a unity, or that the use of this phrase can outweigh all the evidence against unity. It is a pity the author did not develop this sufficiently to indicate what he meant.

Old Testament Studies. The fifth volume of the series of *Old Testament Studies* [4] issued by the Dutch Old Testament Society has now appeared. It contains fourteen studies, of which nine are in English, four in French, and one in German. Three of the studies are devoted to the Tetragrammaton. B. D. Eerdmans, who died while the volume was in the press, offers unconvincing arguments for the form *Jahu*, while G. J. Thierry replies to his arguments and defends the pronunciation *Yahweh*. B. Alfrink considers the antiquity of the *forma mixta* Jehovah and maintains that it is older than has been supposed. H. A. Brongers offers a study of the expression יראת יהוה/אלהים and shows that it developed in meaning from a mere dread of an unpredictable deity to something of rich and positive significance. Another word study is by the editor, P. A. H. de Boer, who examines the word מִשְּׁאָה and shows that there is no reason to posit two roots for it. In the shortest essay of the volume N. H. Ridderbos argues that in some passages of the Old Testament עָפָר stands for the dust of Sheol, rather than of the earth or the grave. Yet

[1] *Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem iussu Pii PP. XII cura et studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti edita: VII. Liber Verborum Dierum* [1948]. Vatican Press, Rome.

[2] *De Boodschap van het Oude Testament*. Van Gorcum, Assen (1946).

[3] *The Prophetical Conception of Holiness* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift; 1948: 12) [1948]. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, Uppsala; Kr. 1.25.

[4] *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, vol. v., edited by P. A. H. de Boer. Brill, Leiden. (Fl. 17.50).

another careful study is devoted to the expression נֶאֱסַף אֶל־עַמָּיו. In this, which is a second contribution from the pen of B. Alfrink, all the Old Testament passages which contain the phrase are reviewed, and it is shown that it has far more shades of meaning than one would suppose from the usual handbooks.

One or two studies are devoted to the exegesis of difficult texts. Th. C. Vriezen upholds the Massoretic reading of Ru 4^5, but renders ' with regard to Ruth, I maintain the rights to raise up (with her) the name of the dead.' He maintains that the redemption of the property and the levirate marriage are two distinct things, and that Boaz did not offer the nearer kinsman the second. This leaves quite unexplained why Boaz should claim precedence over a nearer kinsman, and why he should counsel great secrecy precisely because there is a nearer kinsman, who manifestly has rights that Boaz cannot override. Vriezen also offers an ingenious and intriguing argument that the words אַחַר כָּבוֹד in Zech 2^{12} are the note of an ancient textual critic, who wished to indicate that *v.* 12b should be transferred to follow *v.* 9, in which the word כבוד stands. J. van der Ploeg holds that in Is 59^{13} עשק has the Syriac sense of *calumniate*, while סרה is to be explained from Akk. sarâru, which means *to lie with injurious intent.* In Pr 7^{22} he reads אַיִל with the Versions, and takes עכם to be an infinitive construct, meaning *to leap.* In Ezk 23^{23} for פְּקוֹד he reads פקוד or פקיד and adduces Arabic evidence to support the meaning *bent* or *crippled* for קוע.

On the basis of some verses in Micah, A. H. Edelkoort draws an over-simple and over-sharp distinction between the false prophets and the true, while W. H. Gispen argues, in an article that is not very thoroughgoing, that the distinction between clean and unclean rests on the idea of Holiness, and the necessity that Israel should not be as other nations. M. A. Beek studies the religious background of Am 2^{6-8}, and M. David examines Jer $34^{8ff.}$ in the light of the Pentateuchal laws, and holds that the passage rests on the Deuteronomic Law.

The only contribution in the field of archæology is by J. Simons, who offers a judicious discussion of the question of the location of Sodom and Gomorrah, and decides in favour of the northern end of the Dead Sea.

It will be seen that the volume provides a varied diet, and that it can offer substantial rewards to the reader. The small Society that sponsors and produces it is to be warmly congratulated on its courage and enterprise.

Excavations at Tello. Professor André Parrot, the well known French archæologist,[1] has now published a finely illustrated and well-written volume on *Tello* [2]—the ancient Lagash, in Babylonia—in which he reviews the work of the twenty archæological expeditions to the site between 1877 and 1933. In the most recent expeditions of this series Professor Parrot himself took part. After a brief survey of these many campaigns, the author studies the materials brought to light in the order of the historical periods from which they come. There is a full and classified catalogue of all the very varied finds, and the many fine plates and other illustrations add greatly to the value of the volume. The city excavated was an important Babylonian centre, which played a real part in the history of the ancient world from the very earliest times, and readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES may recall that the late Dr. J. W. Jack noted in its pages the bearing of the Tello excavations on the Old Testament.[3]

Professor Parrot devotes a chapter to the gods and goddesses of Tello, and adds a valuable bibliography, containing brief notes on most of the titles it contains. Altogether this volume makes an important addition to our literature on the archæology of the Biblical lands.

H. H. ROWLEY.
Manchester University.

[1] Cf. his *Archéologie mésopotamienne*, i. [1946]. See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lix. [October, 1947] 22.

[2] *Tello : vingt campagnes de fouilles* (1877–1933) [1948]. Albin Michel, Paris.

[3] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, l. [December, 1938] 137.

Entre Nous.

Anglican Saints.

As every one knows, the Church of England is fortunate indeed in the enviable possession of a long line of saints, some of them notably winsome, and not a few marked by a certain sturdy English commonsense that saved them from the unfortunate excesses to which sainthood seems liable. Here comes a pleasant book, *Flame Touches Flame* (Longmans ; 10s. 6d. net) in which Miss Margaret Cropper, a happy and wholehearted devotee of her own Church, gives us some vivid studies of

six Anglican saints of the seventeenth century. At this time of day it is not easy to say anything particularly new about either George Herbert or Henry Vaughan. But the company of these dedicated spirits, so remote from evil, is always healing to the soul. To Nicholas Ferrar, that amazing being who has influenced so many, I have never felt specially drawn. Indeed, if our author will allow the remark, he and some others of her Anglican saints are every whit as hide-bound by rules and regulations as were the more rigorous of the Puritans whom she so instinctively dislikes. Jeremy Taylor is not much read these days, one fears. Even the 'Holy Living' is not visible on many people's shelves. And when was the latest edition of the 'Golden Grove' produced? Yet, over a waste of years, many things in it linger in the memory, like that curt admonition about prayer, Do not lie to God; a very necessary warning, and one difficult to carry out with thoroughness. It is, of course, a pity that the man who wrote that fine book 'The Liberty of Prophesying' did not, at the pinch, give to others what he claimed as a right for himself. Our author, slow to criticize her own side as she is, is a bit unhappy about this; and makes what seems a lame defence. What could he do? she asks. He could have resigned, as another of her heroes, Ken, did rather than soil his principles. 'Better, Ken felt,' she says, 'to lose all, to be rejected and despised, than to keep his post with a nagging conscience.' That Taylor was an authentic saint no one but a rash man will care to dispute. But he was trained by Laud, that fanatic for uniformity, insistent that all men must adopt one way, his way, or take the consequences.

Perhaps the least known of those here dealt with is that Margaret Godolphin who was a Maid of Honour in the unspeakable Court of Charles II; and, in that polluted atmosphere, contrived to attain to a remarkable saintliness. Her life was written by good John Evelyn. I wish that many quotations from it that I miss had been given us in this discerning study. As, for example, these from almost contiguous pages—'She made virtue and holiness a cheerful thing, lovely as herself.' Or this from a letter to Evelyn, 'I fancy I could speak of God for ever; and indeed, what else can we speak of but our God, of whom we can never say enough.' Evelyn assures us that this lovely and happy-hearted person 'had not been two years at Court before her virtue, beauty, and wit made her be looked upon as a little miracle.' No doubt Evelyn was a perfervid admirer; and in that putrid atmosphere others may have been less attracted to her than he was. Yet he knew her well; and there is no evidence he was not right. If so, what an achievement it was to live so gaily and purely in such gross surroundings! As Lucian put it, after a grim description of the evils crowding in on one in Rome, 'Yet, to give evil its due, believe me there is no better school for virtue, no test of moral strength than life in this same city. It is no easy thing to withstand so many temptations, so many allurements and distractions of sight and sound. There is no help for it; like Odysseus we must sail past them all; here there must be no binding of hands, no stopping of one's ears with wax. That would be sorry courage. Our ears must hear; our hands must be free; and our contempt must be genuine.'

A. J. Gossip.

A Notable Bishop.[1]

Notable, certainly; in some ways, great. But great must be reserved for men with gifts to which Winnington-Ingram had no pretensions. He was not a scholar, which the great bishops were, or an administrator or a statesman, which most of them were. He did not appeal to the intellectuals who looked on him with good-natured contempt. Once on an occasion when there were a good many academic pundits present the Bishop preached on his reasons for believing in God. As the audience dispersed, one philosopher said to another: 'According to the latest pronouncement of science, the Supreme Being is a very long way off. Perhaps it's a good thing that it will be several million light-years before He hears that.' But if he had none of the high-brow gifts, he certainly was a great pastor, and also a great evangelist. There are no doubt many, like myself, who can go back to his Lenten Missions. Each year he held a Mission in one selected district of London. He chose a special theme which was carefully divided into particular subjects. There were great meetings skilfully organized, and each Wednesday evening he answered questions which had been sent in during the week. The whole purpose was evangelistic and it was admirably carried out. Every year the addresses and answers to questions were published in a paper-covered book at a shilling. I read all the volumes each year with intense enjoyment and much profit. The Bishop was at his best in work like this. His faith, while reasoned out, was really based on experience. He believed in God because he believed in Jesus Christ. It has often been the other way with many, but Winnington-Ingram shared Liddon's experience. 'My Christianity safeguards my theism,' and the power of his evangelism was that it centred on Christ.

[1] *Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London, 1901–1939*, by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton; 20s. net.).

Another gift which the Bishop possessed in a high degree was mental readiness. In the earlier days he was the best debater who met the fierce attacks on religion in 'the Park.' He set up his open-air pulpit right in the middle of the crowd and faced the music with zest. His pulpit drew far the biggest crowds and he was generally regarded as being too much for the secularist. Sometimes his answers to questions would not have stood careful examination. But they were honest answers and sufficed for the occasion.

Probably the chief impression left on any reader's mind by Dr. Carpenter's biography is of one who was immensely attractive because of his good-hearted friendliness. He appealed to all classes, peer and peasant alike, by his genial personality, his unconventionality and his readiness to go all lengths to help any one in need. In the Spring of 1915 he had the opportunity of visiting the troops in France. Field-Marshal French gladly invited him and sent him a personal message: 'Five minutes of you cheers me up. Come out for ten days.' The Bishop was immensely impressed by the fact that so many people were in need of personal aid, and he laid himself out to be a messenger of hope and recovery, often with the finest success. He did not think he was condescending. He was at home with every one who needed a friend. His personal contacts were of all kinds. Once he was talking with an old shepherd and asked him, 'How many sheep have you got?' ''Bout a hundred,' was the reply. 'I'm a sort of shepherd too,' said the Bishop. 'How many sheep have you?' said the man. 'About four million,' said the Bishop, and the old shepherd retorted, 'Eh! What do you do at lambing-time?'

The Bishop has been happy in his biographer. The Dean of Exeter is a very able man, but he also wields a facile pen, just the pen for this particular job. I confess to have been fascinated by the story he tells. Since the old days of the London Missions I have felt an affection and admiration for the Bishop, and have read, I think, all he wrote. And these feelings have been heightened by the admirable presentation of what has obviously been a congenial theme.

F. J. Rae.

Toyohiko Kagawa.

While Mr. Athol Forest was with the Occupation Forces in Japan he met Dr. Kagawa and at the request of a group of Christians in Yamaguchi provided transport for his party. In *The Student*, New Zealand, Mr. Forest describes the journey and the impression that Kagawa—'this modern saint'—made upon him.

'Kagawa had just crossed from Kyushu to Southern Honshu and I picked him up at Shimonoseki where he had at 10 a.m. addressed a group of over three thousand people. From there we went to Ube and had lunch at a Japanese hotel before going to a further meeting in a large theatre where about five thousand were present . . .

'From Ube we travelled on to Bofu, where a further large meeting was held in the evening. The following day Kagawa was busy in and around the city of Yamaguchi, and on the morning after I took him to Tokuyama. From there he passed on out of our area, having in three days held eight large meetings and covered about two hundred and twenty miles.

'The preconceived conception I had of Dr. Kagawa was shattered when I first met the man. I saw a small, unimposing, dishevelled, haggard person wearing very thick glasses . . .

'But when I had been in his company for a time I realized the outstanding character, the amazing vitality and the absorbing enthusiasm of this man. All his energy and time were being devoted to the urgent task of evangelism and it wasn't easy going. Travelling in overcrowded trains, bumping over terrible roads in our three-ton truck, sacrificing sleep and even meals is not our idea of making an evangelistic tour. But Kagawa was glad to do this for the sake of his fellow-men, though the strain was visibly telling on him.

'To talk of anything apart from Japan's need of the gospel and his own work was almost impossible with Kagawa, so wrapped up was he in his mission. He maintained that the people themselves realized their own culture had failed them and they were now curious to learn what Christianity could offer them in this situation. Never before was the opportunity so great. This is plainly evident when one Christian was able in three days to lead over two thousand five hundred Japanese to decide to follow the Christ's way.'

The Social Gospel Re-examined.

The publishers, Messrs. James Clark & Co., have notified us that Mr. F. Ernest Johnson's *The Social Gospel Re-examined* is out of print. The Editors regret that a notice of this book was through an unfortunate error included in our last issue.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.